

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 90-222 S. 2388

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 2388	1,2
Summary of Public Law 90-222	3

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 2388

April	10, 1967	Rep. Perkins introduced and discussed H. R. 8311 which was referred to H. Education and Labor Committee. Print of bill and remarks of author.
April	14, 1967	Sen. Clark introduced and discussed S. 1645 which was referred to S. Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Print of bill and remarks of author.
Sept.	12, 1967	Senate committee reported S. 2388. S. Report 563. Print of bill and report.
Sept.	19, 1967	Sen. Jackson submitted proposed amendment to S. 2388 re Job Corps.
Sept.	21, 1967	S. 2388 was made unfinished business.
Sept.	22, 1967	Senate began debate on S. 2388.
Sept.	25, 1967	Senate continued debate on S. 2388.
Sept.	26, 1967	Senate continued debate on S. 2388.
Sept.	27, 1967	Senate continued debate on S. 2388.
Sept.	28, 1967	Senate continued debate on S. 2388.
Sept.	29, 1967	Senate continued debate on S. 2388.
Oct.	2, 1967	Senate made S. 2388 unfinished business.
Oct.	3, 1967	Senate continued debate on S. 2388.
Oct.	4, 1967	Senate continued debate on S. 2388.
Oct.	5, 1967	Senate passed S. 2388 with amendments.
Oct.	9, 1967	S. 2388 was referred to H. Education and Labor Committee. Print of bill as referred.
Oct.	20, 1967	H. committee voted to report S. 2388.
Oct.	27, 1967	H. committee reported S. 2388 with amendments. H. Report 866. Print of bill and report.
Nov.	2, 1967	H. Rules Committee reported resolution for consideration of S. 2388. H. Res. 966, H. Report 884. Print of resolution and report.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 2388, cont'd

Nov.	3, 1967	House adopted resolution for consideration of S. 2388.
Nov.	7, 1967	House began debate on S. 2388.
Nov.	8, 1967	House continued debate on S. 2388.
Nov.	9, 1967	House continued debate on S. 2388.
Nov.	13, 1967	House continued debate on S. 2388.
Nov.	14, 1967	House continued debate on S. 2388.
Nov.	15, 1967	House continued debate on S. 2388. House passed S. 2388 with amendments.
		House conferees were appointed.
Nov.	16, 1967	Senate conferees were appointed.
Nov.	17, 1967	Rep. O'Hara replaced Rep. Daniels as conferee.
Dec.	5, 1967	Conferees agreed to file report on S. 2388.
Dec.	7, 1967	House received conference report on S. 2388.
Dec.	8, 1967	Senate agreed to conference report on S. 2388.
Dec.	11, 1967	House agreed to conference report on S. 2388.
Dec.	23, 1967	Approved: Public Law 90-222.

Hearings: H. committee on H. R. 8311, Parts 1 - 5.

S. committee Misc. Hg. Parts 1 - 15.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 90-222

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967. Authorizes appropriation of various amounts under the Economic Opportunity Act for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Modifies the authorization for the Job Corps in a number of ways. Authorizes a new position as assistant CAP director for rural areas. Authorizes the OEO Director to provide financial assistance for a variety of work and training programs in rural as well as urban areas. Under the Community Action section, requires that the director take steps to further extension of benefits to residents of rural areas and to establish criteria so there will be equitable distribution of aid between urban and rural areas within the States. Specifically mentions rural areas as areas in which the small business loans may be made if there is a high proportion of unemployment or low-income families. Authorizes the Small Business Administration to use the agencies, agreements, and delegations developed under Title III of the Act, as necessary, to make sure that this program operates extensively in rural areas.

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8311

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 10, 1967

Mr. PERKINS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

A BILL

To provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity
4 Amendments of 1967".

5 AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

6 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under
7 the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C
8 of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be ap-
9 propriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum

J. 65-001-GG—1

1 of \$2,060,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions of
2 section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made
3 available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$874,000,000
4 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I of
5 such Act, \$1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out
6 title II, \$47,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title III,
7 \$70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, \$16,-
8 000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and
9 \$31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII.

10 TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC
11 OPPORTUNITY ACT

12 JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS

13 SEC. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Oppor-
14 tunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

15 “PART A—JOB CORPS

16 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

17 “SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-
18 income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth
19 standards and procedures for selecting individuals as en-
20 rollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of
21 residential centers in which enrollees will participate in
22 intensive programs of education, vocational training, work
23 experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes
24 various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to
25 the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps.

1 Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can
2 benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in
3 a group setting distinct from their current environment,
4 to become more responsible, employable, and productive
5 citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where
6 feasible, to the development of National, State, and com-
7 munity resources, and to the development and dissemination
8 of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can
9 be widely utilized by public and private institutions and
10 agencies.

11 "ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

12 "SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office
13 of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

14 "INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

15 "SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a
16 young man or woman must be a person who—

17 "(1) is a permanent resident of the United States
18 who has attained age sixteen but not attained age twenty-
19 two at the time of enrollment;

20 "(2) is a low-income individual or member of a
21 low-income family who requires additional education,
22 training, or intensive counseling and related assistance
23 in order to secure and hold meaningful employment,
24 participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify

1 for other training programs suitable to his needs or satisfy
2 Armed Forces requirements;

3 “(3) is currently living in an environment so char-
4 acterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife
5 or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair
6 his prospects for successful participation in any other
7 program providing needed training, education, or assist-
8 ance;

9 “(4) is determined, after careful screening as pro-
10 vided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present
11 capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure
12 the full benefit of the program authorized in this part,
13 and to be free of medical and behaviorial problems so
14 serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust
15 to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern
16 of work and training which that program involves;

17 “(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as
18 the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with
19 all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

20 “SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL
21 PROVISIONS

22 “SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary
23 rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enroll-
24 ment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these
25 rules shall be implemented through arrangements which

1 make use of public or private nonprofit agencies and orga-
2 nizations such as community action agencies, public employ-
3 ment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations.
4 The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for
5 conducting screening and selection activities; shall encourage
6 recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact
7 with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accord-
8 ingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and
9 problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with
10 other individuals and organizations, including courts, proba-
11 tion and parole offices, law enforcement authorities, schools,
12 welfare agencies, and medical agencies, and advisers. They
13 shall also provide for—

14 “(1) an interview with each applicant for the pur-
15 pose of—

16 “(A) determining whether his educational and
17 vocational needs can best be met through the Job
18 Corps or any alternative program in his home
19 community;

20 “(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent
21 data relating to his background, needs, and interests
22 for evaluation in determining his eligibility and po-
23 tential assignment; and

24 “(C) giving the applicant a full understand-
25 ing of the Job Corps program and making clear

1 what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the
2 event of his acceptance.

3 “(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic in-
4 quiry concerning the applicant’s background for the
5 effective development and, as appropriate, clarification
6 of information concerning his age, citizenship, school
7 and draft status, health, employability, past behavior,
8 family income, environment, and other matters related
9 to a determination of his eligibility.

10 “(b) The Director shall make no payments to any in-
11 dividual or organization solely as compensation for the serv-
12 ice of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the
13 Job Corps.

14 “SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

15 “SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an
16 enrollee unless it is determined that he can participate suc-
17 cessfully in group situations and activities with other en-
18 rollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior
19 that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit
20 of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of
21 sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any
22 center to which he might be assigned and surrounding com-
23 munities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both
24 the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences
25 of failure to observe those rules. An individual shall be con-

1 sidered not to meet these requirements if he has a history of
2 serious and violent behavior against persons or property,
3 repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction or other major
4 behavioral aberrations. The rules or regulations issued by
5 the Director under this section shall specify, in detail, the
6 actions or attributes which shall preclude selection, and those
7 rules or regulations shall be binding upon all agencies au-
8 thorized to screen or select persons for enrollment. The
9 Director may authorize screening and selection agencies to
10 refer to him cases where, notwithstanding the fact that the
11 individual is not subject to specific disqualification set forth
12 in those rules or regulations, they believe that there may be
13 doubt as to whether he should be accepted; and cases where,
14 notwithstanding a specific disqualification, they believe there
15 may be unusual circumstances warranting an exception to
16 permit selection. Exceptions, however, shall be granted by
17 the Director only where he determines that selection would
18 be fully consistent with the standards relating to the interests
19 of other enrollees, the maintenance of discipline and satis-
20 factory community relations, as set forth in this section.

21 “(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enroll-
22 ment may be selected even though he is on probation or
23 parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision
24 of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually
25 satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not

1 violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director
2 has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and
3 all reports to State or other authorities that may be neces-
4 sary to comply with applicable probation or parole require-
5 ments.

6 “(c) The Director shall maintain a continuing review
7 of the criteria and procedures established under this part
8 for the screening and selection of Job Corps applicants both
9 with respect to their adequacy and the effectiveness with
10 which they are applied, and he shall take such actions as
11 may be necessary to assure that all agencies which are
12 assigned screening and selection functions comply fully with
13 those criteria and procedures.

14 “ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

15 “SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the
16 Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director
17 may authorize in special cases.

18 “(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve
19 any individual of obligations under the Universal Military
20 Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

21 “(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of
22 Cuba described in section 609 (3) of this Act) must take
23 and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form:
24 ‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and
25 allegiance to the United States of America and will support

1 and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States
2 against all its enemies foreign and domestic.' The provi-
3 sions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall
4 be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

5 “(d) Each enrollee shall be assigned to a center appro-
6 priate to his needs, as determined by the Director, which
7 (taking into account current vacancies and requirements for
8 the efficient program operation) is closest to the residence of
9 such enrollee.

10 “(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so
11 that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those en-
12 rollees are assigned to conservation centers, as described in
13 section 107, or to other centers or projects where their work
14 activity is primarily directed to the conservation, develop-
15 ment, or management of public national resources or recrea-
16 tional areas and is performed under the direction of personnel
17 of agencies regularly responsible for those functions.

18 “JOB CORPS CENTERS

19 “SEC. 107. The Director may make agreements with
20 Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for
21 the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These
22 centers shall be primarily residential in character and shall
23 be designated and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a
24 well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training,
25 work experience (either in direct program activities or

1 through arrangements with employers) , counseling and other
2 services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall in-
3 clude conservation centers to be located primarily in rural
4 areas and to provide, in addition to other training and as-
5 sistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities
6 to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or
7 public recreational areas or to assist in developing community
8 projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's
9 training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas
10 and to provide activities which shall include training and
11 other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected
12 to participate successfully in training for specific types of
13 skilled or semiskilled employment; and women's training cen-
14 ters, to be located in either urban or rural areas, and which
15 shall provide education, training, and other activities appro-
16 priate to the special needs and potentialities of young women.

17 "PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

18 "SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be oper-
19 ated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-orga-
20 nized and fully supervised program of education, vocational
21 training, work experience, planned avocational and recrea-
22 tional activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and
23 counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required pro-
24 gram for each enrollee shall include activities designed to
25 assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with

1 problems he may encounter in his home community or in
2 adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing
3 his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-
4 term upward mobility, and shall aggregate at least sixty hours
5 a week. Center programs shall include required participa-
6 tion in center maintenance support and related work activity
7 as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of
8 contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

9 “(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may ar-
10 range for enrollee education and vocational training through
11 local public or private educational agencies, vocational educa-
12 tional institutions, or technical institutes where these institu-
13 tions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and
14 substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could
15 provide through other means.

16 “(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent
17 feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain
18 the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;
19 and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of
20 Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to
21 be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their
22 services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee’s
23 level of educational attainment.

24 “(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure
25 that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do

1 not displace presently employed workers or impair existing
2 contracts for service and will be coordinated with other
3 work-experience programs in the community.

4 "ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

5 "SEC. 109. (a) The Director may provide enrollees
6 with such personal travel and leave allowances, and such
7 quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing,
8 recreational services, and other expenses as he may deem
9 necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances
10 shall be established at a rate not to exceed \$50 per month,
11 except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Direc-
12 tor; shall be graduated up to the maximum so as to encour-
13 age achievement and the best use by the enrollee of the funds
14 so provided; and shall be subject to reduction in appropriate
15 cases as a disciplinary measure. To the degree reasonable,
16 enrollees shall be required to meet or contribute to costs
17 associated with their individual comfort and enjoyment from
18 their personal allowances.

19 "(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules govern-
20 ing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of
21 emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs
22 connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed
23 at least six months service in the Job Corps.

24 "(c) The Director may provide each former enrollee,

1 upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to
2 exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the
3 Job Corps. No enrollee shall be entitled to a readjustment
4 allowance, however, unless he has remained in the program
5 at least ninety days, except in unusual circumstances as deter-
6 mined by the Director. The Director may, from time to
7 time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions
8 of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems neces-
9 sary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by
10 that enrollee; and he may also, pursuant to rules or regula-
11 tions, reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allow-
12 ance as a penalty for misconduct during participation in the
13 Job Corps. In the event of an enrollee's death during his
14 period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment
15 allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions
16 of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

17 “(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may
18 determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an
19 enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory
20 service may be paid during the period of service of the en-
21 rollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any
22 other relative who draws substantial support from the en-
23 rollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the
24 payment of an equal amount by the Director.

“STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

1
2 “SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of
3 conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently
4 enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees,
5 dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations
6 shall be made in every instance where it is determined that
7 retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center,
8 will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct
9 and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other
10 enrollees.

11 “(b) In order to promote the proper moral and dis-
12 ciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual direc-
13 tors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to
14 take appropriated disciplinary measures against enrollees in-
15 cluding, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps,
16 subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority,
17 as provided under regulations set by the Director.

“COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

18
19 “SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall
20 cooperate in activities designed to establish a mutually
21 beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers and sur-
22 rounding or nearby communities. These activities shall in-
23 clude the establishment of community advisory councils to
24 provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common prob-

1 lems and for planning programs of mutual interest. Youth
2 participation in advisory council affairs shall be encouraged
3 and where feasible separate youth councils may be estab-
4 lished, to be composed of representative enrollees and rep-
5 resentative young people from the communities. The
6 Director shall establish necessary rules and take necessary
7 action to assure that each center is operated in a manner
8 consistent with this section with a view to achieving, so far
9 as possible, objectives which shall include: (1) giving
10 community officials appropriate advance notice of changes
11 in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect or
12 be of interest to the community; (2) affording the com-
13 munity a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern
14 to it, including policies governing the issuance and terms of
15 passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full
16 and rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies,
17 including law enforcement agencies and agencies which work
18 with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the
19 fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or
20 projects for community improvement or betterment, with
21 adequate advance consultation with business, labor, profes-
22 sional, and other interested community groups and organiza-
23 tions; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events
24 in which enrollees and local residents may participate to-

1 gether; (6) providing community residents with oppor-
2 tunities to work with enrollees directly, as part-time instruc-
3 tors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center or in the
4 community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career
5 opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8)
6 promoting interchanges of information and techniques among,
7 and cooperative projects involving, the center and community
8 schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young
9 people.

10 “PLACEMENT AND FOLLOWTHROUGH

11 “SEC. 112. The Director shall provide or arrange for
12 necessary services to assist enrollees to secure suitable em-
13 ployment or further training opportunities, to return to school
14 or pursue their education, or undertake some other activity
15 having a career potential. To the extent feasible, placement
16 services shall be undertaken through or in cooperation with
17 agencies or organizations, including the public employment
18 service, which will be in a position to provide enrollees with
19 reasonable followthrough necessary or appropriate to aid
20 them in making a satisfactory initial adjustment with par-
21 ticular attention to those enrollees who in the course of com-
22 pleting their enrollment in a satisfactory manner have
23 demonstrated the motivation to overcome special handicaps,
24 or who face unusual adjustment problems, as in a new com-
25 munity.

“EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS

“SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program, with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as practicable, and providing information needed to assess the effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods of operation. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other Government and private agencies specific information concerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program.

“(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration projects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transporta-

tion and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. Projects under this subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, including programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility and usefulness. He shall, either in his annual report or a separate annual document, report to the Congress concerning the actions taken under this section, including a full description of progress made in connection with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

“ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

“SEC. 114. The Director shall make use of advisory committees or boards in connection with the operation of the

1 Job Corps, and the operation of Job Corps centers, when-
2 ever he determines that the availability of outside advice and
3 counsel on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in
4 identifying and overcoming problems, in planning program
5 or center development, or in strengthening relationships be-
6 tween the Job Corps and agencies, institutions, or groups
7 engaged in related activities. Nothing in this section shall
8 be considered as limiting the functions of the National Ad-
9 visory Council, established pursuant to section 605 of this
10 Act, with respect to any matter or question involving the
11 Job Corps; but this shall not prevent the establishment
12 through or in cooperation with the National Advisory Coun-
13 cil of one or more boards or committees under this section.

14 "PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

15 "SEC. 115. (a) The Director shall take necessary action
16 to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job
17 Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation
18 with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to
19 the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of en-
20 rollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaning-
21 ful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and
22 coordination with State-operated programs.

23 "(b) The Director may enter into agreements with
24 States to assist in the operation or administration of State-
25 operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part.

1 The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of
2 the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

3 “(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility
4 designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be estab-
5 lished within a State unless a plan setting forth such pro-
6 posed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and
7 such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days
8 of such submission.

9 “APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

10 “SEC. 116. (a) Except as otherwise specifically pro-
11 vided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees
12 in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees
13 and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to
14 Federal employment, including those regarding hours of
15 work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compen-
16 sation, and Federal employee benefits:

17 “(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of
18 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security
19 Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed em-
20 ployees of the United States and any service performed by an
21 individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in
22 the employ of the United States.

23 “(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of
24 title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation
25 to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be

1 deemed civil employees of the United States within the
2 meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 8101 of
3 title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that sub-
4 chapter shall apply except as follows:

5 “(A) The term ‘performance of duty’ shall not in-
6 clude any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her
7 assigned post of duty, except while participating in an
8 activity (including an activity while on pass or during
9 travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or
10 under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

11 “(B) In computing compensation benefits for dis-
12 ability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be
13 deemed that received under the entrance salary for a
14 grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of
15 title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

16 “(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to
17 accrue until the day following the date on which the
18 injured enrollee is terminated.

19 “(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions
20 in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered
21 employees of the Government.

22 “(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to
23 persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job
24 Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and
25 it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United

1 States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not
2 exceeding \$500.

3 “(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are de-
4 tailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements
5 made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not
6 be counted in computing strength under any law limiting
7 the strength of such services or in computing the percentage
8 authorized by law for any grade therein.

9 “SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

10 “SEC. 117. (a) The Director shall not use any funds
11 made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year
12 ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase above
13 forty-five thousand the enrollee capacity of Job Corps centers.

14 “(b) The Director shall take necessary action to insure
15 that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of
16 Job Corps enrollees in residence and receiving training, at
17 least 25 per centum shall be women.

18 “(c) The Director shall take necessary action to insure
19 that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job
20 Corps centers which have been in operation for more than
21 nine months do not exceed \$7,300 per enrollee.

22 “(d) The Director shall take necessary action to insure
23 that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced
24 or developed with Federal funds in the course of the opera-

tion of any conservation or training center shall become the property of the United States.

“POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

“SEC. 118. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

“(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all

1 political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee,
2 enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political
3 purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation
4 of the Corrupt Practices Act.

5 “(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Com-
6 mission finds that any person has violated the foregoing pro-
7 visions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for
8 explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned,
9 certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as
10 to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.”

11 WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

12 SEC. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic
13 Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part B
14 of such title and amended to read as follows:

15 “PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

16 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

17 “SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful
18 work-experience and work-training opportunities, together
19 with related services and assistance, that will assist low-
20 income youths to continue or resume their education, and to
21 help unemployed, underemployed, or other low-income and
22 severely disadvantaged persons, both young and adult, to
23 obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with max-
24 imum opportunities for local initiative in developing pro-
25 grams which respond to local needs and problems, including

1 programs using both public and private resources to overcome
2 the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in
3 areas having high concentrations of unemployment, under-
4 employment, and low income.

5 "NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

6 "SEC. 121. The Director may provide financial assist-
7 ance for—

8 "(1) programs to provide part-time employment,
9 on-the-job training, and useful work experience for stu-
10 dents from low-income families who are in the ninth
11 through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equiv-
12 alent to that of students in such grades) and who are
13 in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or
14 maintain attendance in school; and

15 "(2) programs to provide unemployed individuals
16 (aged sixteen through twenty-one years at the time of
17 enrollment) with useful work experience and on-the-job
18 training, combined where needed with educational and
19 training assistance, including basic literacy and occupa-
20 tional training, designed to assist those individuals to de-
21 velop their maximum occupational potential.

22 "COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

23 "SEC. 122. (a) The Director may provide financial
24 assistance for community employment and training projects.
25 These projects shall provide work experience, on-the-job, or

1 work training for unemployed, underemployed, or low-
2 income persons (including projects involving both adults and
3 youths age sixteen or over). They shall be designed to
4 assist participants to secure or qualifying for—

5 “(1) permanent, meaningful employment without
6 further assistance under this section, and

7 “(2) wherever possible, entry-level jobs involving
8 the use or acquisition of skills needed for subprofessional
9 or other career opportunities offering promise of regular
10 or continued advancement.

11 “(b) Where feasible and consistent with the objectives
12 of subsection (a), projects under this section shall be de-
13 signed so that participants acquire work skills or experience
14 in activities that involve, or will lead to permanent employ-
15 ment in, fields where there are critical or unmet community
16 needs. These fields may include, without limitation, the
17 management, conservation, or development of natural re-
18 sources, recreational areas, public parks, highways, or other
19 lands; neighborhood redevelopment; the provision of health,
20 education, welfare, or public safety services; or other activi-
21 ties directed to bettering or beautifying a community or area
22 or improving its physical, social, economic, or cultural
23 condition.

24 “(c) Projects under this section shall include related
25 supportive services, including basic education, occupational

1 training, health services, and special counseling, as needed to
2 assist participants to attain the objectives described in sub-
3 section (a).

4 “(d) In determining whether, in what amount and on
5 what conditions, to assist projects or parts of projects other-
6 wise eligible under this section, the Director shall consider—

7 “(1) in all cases, the degree to which efforts have
8 been made to provide assurances of regular employment
9 at the earliest feasible time, and the degree to which the
10 project has been developed and realistically structured
11 so as to take account of the desires, needs, and capabil-
12 ities of participants;

13 “(2) in the case of projects or parts of projects in-
14 volving activities related to physical improvements,
15 whether the improvements will be substantially used by
16 the low-income persons and families or will contribute
17 substantially to amenities or facilities in areas or neigh-
18 borhoods having concentrations of low-income persons
19 and families;

20 “(3) in the case of projects or parts of projects in-
21 volving the development of entry-level employment
22 opportunities, the extent to which the proposed activities
23 will not only benefit those directly participating but will
24 also contribute or give promise of contributing to the
25 broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs or

1 providing job ladder opportunities, the development and
2 recognition of new types of careers for low-income and
3 disadvantaged persons, or the elimination of artificial
4 barriers in the community to employment and advance-
5 ment on the part of those persons.

6 “SPECIAL URBAN EMPLOYMENT IMPACT PROGRAMS

7 “SEC. 123. (a) The Director may provide necessary
8 financial assistance, as provided in this section, to meet costs
9 of developing, planning, and carrying out projects which are
10 designed to assist in meeting some of the critical problems
11 facing urban areas, and to stimulate the fuller and more
12 effective use of the resources which are or can be made
13 available in those areas to permit a substantial increase in
14 employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

15 “(b) Projects under this section must—

16 “(1) be carried on in an urban area or neighbor-
17 hood (defined without regard to political or other
18 subdivision boundaries) having especially large concen-
19 trations of unemployed, underemployed, or low-income
20 individuals, or be primarily designed to serve the needs
21 of such individuals residing in such areas;

22 “(2) be supported by specific commitments of
23 cooperation on the part of public and private employers
24 in the community, including assurances that, to the

1 maximum extent feasible, permanent employment op-
2 portunities have been or will be developed that are
3 commensurate with the size, scope, schedule, and objec-
4 tives of the program.

5 “(3) provide for the maximum feasible use of re-
6 sources under other programs relating to the training
7 of individuals to improve or restore their employability,
8 including commitments of specific training opportunities
9 under the Manpower Development and Training Act
10 of 1962;

11 “(4) be appropriately focused to assure that work
12 and training opportunities are extended, so far as pos-
13 sible, to the most severely disadvantaged individuals who
14 can reasonably be expected, given the other services or
15 support available, to benefit from such training;

16 “(5) include or provide for expanded, more in-
17 tensive, or improved supportive services not generally
18 available, including day care for children, transportation,
19 job orientation, health services, and intensive and con-
20 tinuing counseling, both before and after job placement,
21 as necessary to assist participants to develop necessary
22 job attitudes and the capability to secure, hold, and ad-
23 vance in regular competitive employment;

24 “(6) comply with other requirements prescribed

1 by the Director to assure that programs are realistically
2 structured to take account of the desires, needs and
3 capabilities of participants; are directed so far as possible
4 to specific, measurable goals and subject to adequate pro-
5 visions for continuing local evaluation; are supported by
6 assurances of needed cooperation from all relevant State
7 or local governmental and private agencies; and will
8 otherwise be administered and carried on in an efficient
9 and effective manner.

10 “(c) In addition to necessary costs of developing or
11 planning projects, financial assistance under this section may
12 be used to meet—

13 “(1) costs of initiating or expanding projects or
14 activities which are eligible for financial assistance under
15 other sections of this part;

16 “(2) costs of expanding projects or activities under
17 other programs related to the training of individuals for
18 the purpose of improving or restoring employability;

19 “(3) costs of providing required supportive services
20 not otherwise available; and

21 “(4) such other costs of administering, coordinat-
22 ing, or evaluating projects, including the provision of
23 necessary related equipment or facilities, as may be
24 specifically authorized in regulations of the Director.

“COORDINATION

1
2 “SEC. 124. Programs under this part shall be carried
3 on with appropriate assistance from other Federal agencies
4 having related responsibilities and shall be coordinated with
5 other local and community programs, including maximum
6 coordination with community action programs. They shall
7 include necessary arrangements to best assure that individ-
8 uals are recruited, referred, and provided with training,
9 work experience, and other assistance in the manner that most
10 accurately reflects each person’s capacity to benefit from
11 several programs authorized under this title and from other
12 programs available to him which provide services designed
13 to enhance or restore employability.

14 “PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS: APPLICATION OF FEDERAL

15 LAWS

16 “SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this
17 part must be individuals who are permanent residents of
18 the United States. For purposes of determining eligibility
19 for participation in programs under this part, any individual
20 shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family
21 receives cash welfare payments.

22 “(b) Participants shall not be deemed Federal em-
23 ployees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law
24 relating to Federal employment, including those relating to

1 hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment
2 compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

3 "GENERAL CONDITIONS FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

4 "SEC. 126. The Director shall not provide financial
5 assistance for any program under this part unless he deter-
6 mines, in accordance with such regulations as he may pre-
7 scribe, that—

8 "(1) no participant will be employed on projects
9 involving political parties, or the construction, opera-
10 tion, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is
11 used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place
12 for religious worship;

13 "(2) the program will not result in the displace-
14 ment of employed workers or impair existing contracts
15 for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for
16 other funds in connection with work that would other-
17 wise be performed;

18 "(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-
19 training and education, and other conditions of employ-
20 ment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light
21 of such factors as the type of work, geographical region,
22 and proficiency of the participant;

23 "(4) the program will, to the maximum extent
24 feasible, contribute to the occupational development or
25 upward mobility of individual participants.

1 “EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

2 “SEC. 127. (a) The Director shall establish criteria
3 designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance
4 under sections 121 and 122 among the States. In develop-
5 ing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant
6 factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family
7 income levels.

8 “(b) Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal
9 year for programs authorized under this title, the Director
10 shall reserve not to exceed 25 per centum for the purpose
11 of carrying out section 123; but not more than $12\frac{1}{2}$ per
12 centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be
13 used within any one State.

14 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

15 “SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly, through
16 contracts or other appropriate arrangements) such technical
17 assistance or training for personnel as he determines is neces-
18 sary to assist in the initiation or effective operation of pro-
19 grams under this part. He shall, in exercising this authority,
20 give special consideration to the problems of rural areas, with
21 a view to simplifying procedures and other technical require-
22 ments wherever feasible; developing model programs or
23 projects; assisting rural areas to secure or better use resources
24 under other programs relating to increasing or restoring

1 employability and to combine those with projects or pro-
2 grams under this part; and generally assisting agencies in
3 rural areas to develop and carry on the most effective pro-
4 grams consistent with local conditions.

5 "LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

6 "SEC. 129. (a) Federal financial assistance to any pro-
7 gram or activity carried out pursuant to sections 121, 122,
8 and 123 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the
9 cost of such program or activity, including costs of adminis-
10 tration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in
11 excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regu-
12 lations establishing objective criteria for such determinations,
13 that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this
14 part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind,
15 fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equip-
16 ment, and services.

17 "(b) In the case of on-the-job training projects with
18 other than public or private nonprofit organizations, the
19 Director may authorize or enter into agreements to pay
20 reasonable training costs, but not wages paid to participants
21 for services performed.

1 “(c) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure
2 that programs under this part are carried on subject to
3 adequate internal controls, accounting requirements, and rules
4 governing personnel standards and policies as may be neces-
5 sary or appropriate to promote efficiency and the effective
6 use of funds.

7 “(d) Financial assistance under this part shall be ex-
8 tended only to projects which are sponsored by public or
9 private nonprofit agencies. The Director may, however,
10 contract in special cases for the carrying out of projects or
11 parts of projects by other private organizations where he
12 finds such a contract to be justified on the basis of efficiency
13 and economy and otherwise consistent with the provisions
14 and purposes of this part.

15 “EVALUATION

16 “SEC. 130. The Director shall provide for the continuing
17 evaluation of the programs under this title, including their
18 effectiveness in achieving stated goals and their impact on
19 other related programs. He may, for this purpose, contract
20 for independent evaluations of those programs or individual
21 projects.”

1 COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

2 SEC. 103. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of
3 1964 is amended to read as follows:

4 “TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY
5 ACTION PROGRAMS

6 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

7 “SEC. 201. This title provides for community action
8 agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes
9 the functions of community action agencies, and author-
10 izes financial assistance to community action programs and
11 related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimu-
12 late a better focusing of all available local, State, private, and
13 Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income
14 families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and
15 urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations
16 and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully
17 self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote, as meth-
18 ods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of
19 individual and family self-sufficiency—

20 “(1) the strengthening of community capabilities
21 for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other
22 assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that
23 this assistance, through the efforts of local officials, orga-
24 nizations, and interested and affected citizens, can be
25 made more responsible to local needs and conditions;

1 “(2) the better organization of a range of services
2 related to the needs of the poor, so that these services
3 may be made more effective and efficient in helping
4 families and individuals to overcome particular problems
5 in a way that takes account of, and supports their prog-
6 ress in overcoming, related problems;

7 “(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evalua-
8 tion, of new types of services and innovative approaches
9 in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increas-
10 ingly effective methods of employing available resources;

11 “(4) the development and implementation of all
12 programs and projects designed to serve the poor or
13 low-income areas with the maximum feasible participa-
14 tion of residents of the areas and members of the groups
15 served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of
16 capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those
17 programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and
18 widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and

19 “(5) the broadening of the resource base of pro-
20 grams directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to
21 secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public
22 officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood
23 organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role
24 for business, labor, and professional groups able to pro-
25 vide employment opportunities or otherwise influence

1 the quantity and quality of services of concern to the
2 poor.

3 "PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND
4 PROGRAMS

5 "ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES;
6 COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

7 "SEC. 210. (a) The Director shall encourage commu-
8 nities to establish public or private nonprofit agencies, to be
9 known as community action agencies. A community action
10 agency shall be responsible for, and must be capable of,
11 planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a pro-
12 gram, to be known as a community action program. A
13 community action program is a community based and oper-
14 ated program—

15 " (1) which includes or is designed to include a suf-
16 ficient number of projects or components to provide, in
17 sum, a range of services and activities having a measur-
18 able and potentially major impact on causes of poverty
19 in the community or those areas of the community
20 where poverty is a particularly acute problem;

21 " (2) which has been developed, and which or-
22 ganizes and combines its component projects and activi-
23 ties, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the
24 purposes of this title; and

25 " (3) which conforms to such other supplementary

criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions of this title.

“(b) Components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency, where consistent with sound and efficient management and applicable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be either specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

“(c) The community in which a community action agency is established to carry on a community action program may be a city, county, multicity, multicounty, or other governmental unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (whether or not its boundaries correspond with those of any political subdivision) ; but it must in any event provide the organizational base and possess the commonality of interest needed for an efficient and effective program conforming to the requirements of this section.

“STRUCTURE OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

“SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency shall be established and constructed so as to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases

1 of the community action program for which it is responsible,
2 and to assure that the program as developed and implemented
3 is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each
4 such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board
5 organized to provide for membership of the chief elected
6 official or officials of the community and other appropriate
7 public officials, or their representatives, of officials or repre-
8 sentatives of private groups and agencies engaged in pro-
9 viding assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representa-
10 tives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and
11 interests in the community. At least one-third of the mem-
12 bership of the board shall be persons chosen in accordance
13 with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that
14 they are representative of the poor in the community. All
15 members of the governing board selected to represent specific
16 geographic areas within a community must reside in the areas
17 they represent. Each community action agency shall estab-
18 lish procedures by which community agencies and represent-
19 ative groups of the poor, including but not limited to mi-
20 nority groups, the elderly and (where applicable) rural
21 residents, which feel themselves inadequately represented
22 may petition for the representation they consider appropriate.

23 “(b) The powers of every community action agency
24 governing board shall include the power to appoint persons
25 to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal,

1 and program policies, to approve overall program plans and
2 priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and
3 approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.

4 "SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY

5 ACTION AGENCIES

6 "SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall respon-
7 sibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and adminis-
8 tering a community action program, a community action
9 agency must have authority under its charter or applicable
10 law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds
11 and contributions from private or local public sources which
12 may be used in support of a community action program, and
13 funds under any Federal or State assistance program pur-
14 suant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the
15 case may be) organized in accordance with this part could
16 act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate
17 for inclusion in a community action program. A community
18 action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so
19 received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject
20 to the powers of its governing board and its overall program
21 responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate
22 powers must include the power to make transfers and dele-
23 gations covering component projects in all cases where this
24 will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise
25 further program objectives.

1 “(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its over-
2 all responsibility for a community action program, a commu-
3 nity action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this
4 title, at least the following functions:

5 “(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating the
6 program, including actions to develop information as to
7 the problems and causes of poverty in the community,
8 determine how much and how effectively assistance is
9 being provided to deal with those problems and causes,
10 and establish priorities among projects, activities and
11 areas as needed for the best and most efficient use of
12 resources.

13 “(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities
14 related to the community action program to plan for,
15 secure and administer assistance available under this title
16 or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis;
17 providing planning or technical assistance to those agen-
18 cies; and generally, in cooperation with community
19 agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve
20 existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-
21 to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing
22 resources on the most needy, and providing additional
23 opportunities to low-income individuals for regular em-
24 ployment or participation in the programs or activities

1 for which those community agencies and officials are
2 responsible.

3 “(3) Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive
4 to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met,
5 with particular emphasis on providing central or com-
6 mon services that can be drawn upon by a variety of
7 related programs, developing new approaches or new
8 types of services that can be incorporated into other
9 programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or
10 modification of those programs.

11 “(4) Establishing effective procedures by which the
12 poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to
13 influence the character of programs affecting their in-
14 terests, providing for their regular participation in the
15 implementation of those programs, and providing tech-
16 nical and other support needed to enable the poor and
17 neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf
18 available assistance from public and private sources.

19 “(5) Joining with and encouraging business, labor,
20 and other private groups and organizations to undertake,
21 together with public officials and agencies, activities in
22 support of the community action program which will re-
23 sult in the additional use of private resources and capabil-
24 ities, with a view to such things as developing new

1 employment opportunities, stimulating investment that
2 will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty
3 among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and
4 providing methods by which residents of those areas
5 can work with private groups, firms, and institutions
6 in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.

7 “STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

8 “SEC. 213. A State or regional agency may be a
9 community action agency for the purpose of programs
10 in a number of rural areas or smaller communities if the
11 Director determines that the agency is structured and capable
12 of operating in a manner consistent with the purposes of
13 this part, including the participation and representation re-
14 quirements of section 211 (a), and that the operation of
15 a State or regional program in the areas or communities
16 concerned is justified on the basis of efficiency and effective-
17 ness.

18 “ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

19 “SEC. 214. (a) Each community action agency shall
20 observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage
21 other agencies participating in a community action program
22 to observe, standards of organization, management and
23 administration which will assure, so far as reasonably pos-
24 sible, that all program activities are conducted in a manner

1 consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective
2 of providing assistance effectively, efficiently and free of
3 any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family
4 favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish
5 or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include
6 rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed
7 by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community
8 action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access
9 to information, including but not limited to public hearings
10 at the request of appropriate community groups and reason-
11 able public access to books and records of the agency or
12 other agencies engaged in program activities or operations
13 involving the use of authority or funds for which it is
14 responsible. And each community action agency shall adopt
15 for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising author-
16 ity for which it is responsible rules designed to establish
17 specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel
18 and per diem allowances, and other employee benefits; to
19 assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties
20 with competence and integrity are employed and that em-
21 ployees are promoted or advanced under impartial proce-
22 dures calculated to improve agency performance and effective-
23 ness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of inter-
24 ests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf

1 of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any
2 case preclude employees from participating, in connection
3 with the performance of their duties, in any form of picket-
4 ing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation
5 of law.

6 “(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations
7 to supplement subsection (a), which shall include regula-
8 tions governing matters relating to partisan political activities
9 and elections referred to in section 603 (b) of this Act, and
10 which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on commu-
11 nity action program activities with financial assistance under
12 this title. He may, where appropriate, establish special or
13 simplified requirements for smaller agencies or agencies oper-
14 ating in rural areas. These special requirements shall not,
15 however, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts
16 of interest, use of position or authority for partisan political
17 purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of cus-
18 tomary practices or rules among agencies in the community.
19 The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal
20 agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to
21 activities which may be included in community action pro-
22 grams for the purpose of securing maximum consistency be-
23 tween rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those
24 agencies and those prescribed under this section.

1 "EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND
2 PROGRAMS

3 "SEC. 215. (a) In determining whether, in which
4 amount, and on what conditions, to extend financial assist-
5 ance to a new community action program, the Director shall
6 consider evidence of the extent of poverty in the community
7 and the probable capacity of the agency to undertake an
8 efficient and effective program in full conformity to the pur-
9 poses of this title. In renewing or supplementing that finan-
10 cial assistance, he shall consider the progress made in carry-
11 ing on such a program, consistent with needs and with due
12 allowance for the special problems of rural and smaller com-
13 munities, and the efficiency with which the agency has dis-
14 charged its specific functions and duties to this end. The
15 Director shall prescribe standards for evaluation of overall
16 effectiveness and specific agency operations in accordance
17 with this subsection. In developing those standards he shall
18 consider, but not be limited to, the use of criteria covering:
19 the number and incomes of persons or families served and
20 seeking to be served and the length of their participation; the
21 extent to which those persons and families have been aided in
22 establishing specific goals and have in fact attained those
23 goals; the extent to which resources have been committed
24 which are over and above the contributions required by this

1 title; the degree to which full use has been made of sources
2 of financial assistance other than this title; the degree to
3 which agencies, groups, and organizations, including the poor
4 and area representatives, have actively participated in the
5 formulation and implementation of the program in question;
6 the extent and effectiveness of followthrough arrangements
7 among agencies operating different components and related
8 agencies in the community; and the extent to which activi-
9 ties or approaches initiated as part of the program have been
10 incorporated in other ongoing programs in the community.

11 “(b) In addition to evaluations undertaken directly by
12 him or by community action agencies, the Director may pro-
13 vide for, or require community action agencies to provide for,
14 independent evaluations. Where appropriate, he may also
15 require a community action agency to establish an inde-
16 pendent group or committee to provide evaluation and ad-
17 visory services on either a short-term or continuing basis.

18 “PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY
19 ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

20 “DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

21 “SEC. 220. The Director may provide financial assist-
22 ance to community action agencies to assist them in develop-
23 ing community action programs in accordance with this title.
24 He may also provide financial assistance to other public or
25 private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the

1 establishment of a community action agency or participa-
2 tion in a community action program, including assistance to
3 local governments in connection with planning activities
4 and organizational changes to support or improve the effec-
5 tiveness of such programs.

6 "GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE
7 TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

8 "SEC. 221. (a) In order to aid in the implementation of
9 community action programs, the Director may provide gen-
10 eral financial assistance to those programs in accordance
11 with the provisions of this section. This assistance may be
12 used, as approved by the Director, by community action
13 agencies in order to enable them to carry out their planning,
14 coordination, evaluation, and overall administration responsi-
15 bilities as described in part A of this title. It may also be
16 used for the development and operation of approved pro-
17 gram components which are necessary for a fully effective
18 program and for which assistance is not available, as needed,
19 from other sources. These component projects may involve,
20 without limitation, activities providing services, together
21 with necessary related facilities, designed to assist families
22 and individuals to secure and retain meaningful employment;
23 to make better use of available income in connection with
24 efforts for self-advancement; to attain basic educational skills

1 needed for employment, family self-help, or successful par-
2 ticipation in school; to better secure, use, and maintain hous-
3 ing required for a suitable living environment; to undertake
4 family planning consistent with personal and family goals,
5 religious and moral convictions; and to make more frequent
6 and effective use of programs available to help in overcom-
7 ing specific problems. Components providing these or other
8 services may be focused upon the needs of specific low-
9 income groups, such as the very young, youth, the elderly,
10 the unemployed, and persons receiving public assistance,
11 but shall wherever feasible be structured so as to foster family
12 participation and progress.

13 “(b) The Director may provide financial assistance to
14 a public or private nonprofit agency other than a community
15 action agency for activities of the kind described in subsection
16 (a) where he determines, after receiving and considering
17 comments of the community action agency, if any, that there
18 is good cause for the granting of such assistance and that
19 such action would be in furtherance of the policies applicable
20 to this title.

21 “(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or
22 regulations governing applications for assistance under this
23 section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each
24 applicant to secure the views of local public officials and
25 agencies in the community having a direct or substantial in-

1 terest in the application and to resolve all issues of coopera-
2 tion and possible duplication prior to its submission.

3 “SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

4 “SEC. 222. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet
5 or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor
6 which are common to a number of communities, the Director
7 may develop and carry on special programs under this
8 section. This authority shall be used only where the Direc-
9 tor determines that the objectives sought could not be effec-
10 tively achieved through the use of authorities under sections
11 220 and 221, including assistance to components or projects
12 based on models developed and promulgated by him. It
13 shall also be used only with respect to programs which (1)
14 involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely
15 coordinated with community action programs, (2) involve
16 significant new combinations of resources or new and inno-
17 vative approaches, and (3) are structured in a way that will,
18 within the limits of the type of assistance or activities con-
19 templated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of
20 this title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate
21 to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director
22 may provide financial assistance to public or private non-
23 profit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such
24 special programs; but he shall do so in a manner that will
25 encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted

1 projects in community action programs, with a view to mini-
2 mizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the
3 use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons
4 or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing
5 from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in
6 promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs
7 under this section shall include those described in the follow-
8 ing paragraphs:

9 “(1) A program to be known as ‘Project Head-
10 start’ focused upon children who have not reached the
11 age of compulsory school attendance which will provide
12 such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social,
13 and other services, as the Director finds will aid the chil-
14 dren to attain their full potential, together with appro-
15 priate activities to encourage the participation of parents
16 of such children and permit the effective use of parent
17 services.

18 “(2) A ‘legal services program’ to provide legal
19 advice and legal representation to persons when they
20 are unable to afford the services of a private attorney,
21 together with legal research and information, as appro-
22 priate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal in-
23 stitutions, or combinations thereof, in furtherance of the
24 cause of justice among persons living in poverty. Proj-
25 ects involving legal advice and representation shall be

1 carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a law-
2 yer-client relationship consistent with the best standards
3 of the legal profession. The Director shall establish
4 procedures to assure that the principal local bar associa-
5 tions in the area to be served by any proposed project
6 for legal advice and representation are afforded an ade-
7 quate opportunity to submit comments and recommenda-
8 tions on the proposal before it is approved or funded.

9 “(3) A ‘comprehensive health services program’ to
10 aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health
11 services projects focused upon the needs of urban and
12 rural areas having high concentrations of poverty and a
13 marked inadequacy of health services for the poor.
14 These projects shall be designed—

15 “(A) to make possible, with maximum fea-
16 sible use of existing agencies and resources, the pro-
17 vision of comprehensive health services, including
18 but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic,
19 treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and
20 follow-up services, together with necessary related
21 facilities and services; and

22 “(B) to assure that these services are made
23 readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are
24 furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs
25 and with their participation and wherever possible

1 are combined with, or included within, arrangements
2 for providing employment, education, social, or
3 other assistance needed by the families and individ-
4 uals served.

5 Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall
6 be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants
7 to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and
8 may be used, as necessary to pay the full costs of proj-
9 ects. Before approving any project, the Director shall
10 consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health
11 agencies and take such steps as may be required to
12 assure that the program will be carried on under com-
13 petent professional supervision and that existing agencies
14 providing related services are furnished all assistance
15 needed to permit them to plan for participation in the
16 program and for the necessary continuation of those
17 related services.

18 “(4) A program to be known as ‘Upward Bound’
19 designed to generate skills and motivation necessary
20 for success in education beyond high school among
21 young people from low-income backgrounds and inade-
22 quate secondary school preparation. Projects must
23 include arrangements to assure cooperation among one
24 or more institutions of higher education and one or more
25 secondary schools. They must include a curriculum

1 designed to develop the critical thinking, effective ex-
2 pression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-
3 secondary education success, necessary health services
4 and such recreational and cultural and group activities
5 as the Director determines may be appropriate.

6 “(b) In developing programs under subsection (a),
7 the Director shall give priority to programs involving serv-
8 ices or activities whose effectiveness has been tested in one
9 or more community action programs, or in connection with
10 other Federal, State, or local programs, public or private.

11 The Director shall also cooperate with Federal and State
12 agencies with a view to developing, pursuant to subsection
13 (a), programs which will supplement or improve programs
14 for which those agencies are responsible. Where appropri-
15 ate, he shall provide for the operation of programs under sub-
16 section (a) by other Federal or State agencies, pursuant to
17 delegations of authority or suitable agreements.

18 “(c) Programs under subsection (a) may include es-
19 sential training, research, and technical assistance directly
20 related to program development and implementation, and
21 funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in
22 the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect
23 to training, research, and technical assistance activities.

24 “(d) The Director shall provide for the continuing
25 evaluation of the effectiveness of all programs under this

1 section, including their impact in terms of the needs or prob-
2 lems at which they are directed, and their relationship to
3 and effect upon related programs. For this purpose, he
4 shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appro-
5 priate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever fea-
6 sible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a
7 National or State basis. The reports of such studies, together
8 with the comments of the Director and other agencies, if
9 any, thereon, shall be public records and shall be reflected
10 in the annual report of the Director.

11 “ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

12 “SEC. 223. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or
13 allocated for assistance in the development and implementa-
14 tion of community action programs pursuant to sections 220
15 and 221, and for special program projects referred to in sec-
16 tion 222 (a), and which are not subject to any other pro-
17 vision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall
18 allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam,
19 American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,
20 and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs.
21 He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of
22 those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and
23 procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be
24 allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest
25 available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on

1 the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance
2 recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the
3 average number of unemployed persons in each State as
4 compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of
5 related children living with families with incomes of less
6 than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That
7 part of any State's allotment which the Director determines
8 will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during
9 the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to the
10 original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to
11 assure that any amount so made available to any State in
12 excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other
13 States.

14 “(b) The Director may provide for the separate allot-
15 ment of funds for any special program referred to in section
16 222 (a). This allotment may be made in accordance with
17 the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made
18 in accordance with other criteria which he determines will
19 assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the rela-
20 tive incidence in each State of the needs or problems at
21 which the program is directed, except that in no event may
22 more than $12\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the funds for any one program
23 be used in any one State.

24 “(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial
25 assistance extended to a community action agency or other

1 agency pursuant to sections 220, 221, and 222 (a) , for the
2 period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per
3 centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or
4 activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum
5 of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assist-
6 ance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in
7 accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria,
8 that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes
9 of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or
10 in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant,
11 equipment, or services.

12 “ (d) No program shall be approved for assistance under
13 sections 220, 221, and 222 (a) unless the Director satisfies
14 himself (1) that the services to be provided under such pro-
15 gram will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, serv-
16 ices previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2)
17 that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed
18 to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not
19 be diminished in order to provide any contributions required
20 under subsection (c) or otherwise qualify for assistance
21 under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding
22 sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director
23 may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for
24 determinations covering situations where a strict application
25 of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or

1 otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be
2 achieved.

3 "PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

4 "TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

5 "SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or
6 through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assist-
7 ance to communities in developing, conducting, and adminis-
8 tering programs under this title, and (2) training for special-
9 ized or other personnel which is needed in connection with
10 those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purposes
11 of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial
12 assistance under this title, the Director may make special
13 assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise
14 it in the performance of functions related to the assisted
15 activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period
16 of more than two years in the case of any agency.

17 "STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

18 "SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial
19 assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with
20 State law, to enable those agencies—

21 "(1) to provide technical assistance to communities
22 and local agencies in developing and carrying out pro-
23 grams under this title;

24 "(2) to assist in coordinating State activities re-
25 lated to this title;

1 “(3) to advise and assist the Director in develop-
2 ing procedures and programs to promote the participa-
3 tion of States and State agencies in programs under this
4 title; and

5 “(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Eco-
6 nomic Opportunity Council established by section 631
7 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in
8 identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or ad-
9 ministrative requirements that operate to impede State
10 level coordination of programs related to this title, and
11 in developing methods or recommendations for over-
12 coming those problems.

13 “(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies,
14 the Director shall give preference to programs or activities
15 which are administered or coordinated by the agencies desig-
16 nated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been de-
17 veloped and will be carried on with the assistance of those
18 agencies.

19 “RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

20 “SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide
21 financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects con-
22 ducted by public or private agencies which are designed to
23 test or assist in the development of new approaches or
24 methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or

1 otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may
2 also contract or provide financial assistance for research per-
3 taining to the purposes of this title.

4 “(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to
5 govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and
6 the use of all research authority under this title. The plan
7 shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities
8 among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Direc-
9 tor shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose
10 of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects
11 and determining whether the findings resulting from any
12 research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or
13 more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As
14 part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a
15 separate annual report, the Director shall submit a descrip-
16 tion for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this
17 section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings
18 derived from those activities, together with a statement indi-
19 cating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in
20 which the benefits of those activities and findings are ex-
21 pected to be realized.

22 “(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appro-
23 priated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall
24 be used for the purposes of subsection (a).

1 “PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

2 “RURAL AREAS

3 “SEC. 240. (a) In exercising authority under this title,
4 the Director shall take necessary steps to further the exten-
5 sion of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with
6 the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents,
7 and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical
8 competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These
9 steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1)
10 the development under section 222 (a) of programs partic-
11 ularly responsive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the
12 establishment, pursuant to section 232 (a), of a program
13 of research and pilot project activities specifically focused
14 upon the problems of rural poverty; (3) the provision of
15 technical assistance so as to afford a priority to agencies
16 in rural communities and to aid those agencies, through such
17 arrangements as may be appropriate, in securing assistance
18 under Federal programs which are related to this title but
19 which are not generally utilized in rural areas; and (4) the
20 development of special or simplified procedures, forms, guide-
21 lines, model components, and model programs for use in
22 rural areas.

23 “(b) In order to further implement the policy described
24 in subsection (a), the Director shall establish criteria de-

1 signed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under
2 this title within the States between urban and rural areas.
3 In developing those criteria, he shall consider the relative
4 numbers in the States or areas therein of (1) low-income
5 families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed
6 persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on
7 a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations;
8 (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-
9 grade education; and (6) persons rejected for military
10 service.

11 “(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title,
12 the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in
13 rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any
14 project for which assistance to community action agencies is
15 authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish
16 a community action agency within a reasonable period of
17 time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such
18 conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote
19 adherence to the purposes of this title and the early estab-
20 lishment of a community action agency in the area.

21 “(d) The Director shall encourage the development of
22 programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertak-
23 ing of common or related projects, and other methods of
24 cooperation between urban and rural communities, with par-

1 ticular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where
2 it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and be-
3 tween larger urban communities with concentrations of low-
4 income persons and families and rural areas in which sub-
5 stantial numbers of those persons and families have recently
6 resided.

7 “COORDINATION—FEDERAL AGENCIES; USE OF STATE
8 FUNDS

9 “SEC. 241. (a) The heads of all Federal agencies shall
10 cooperate with the Director in carrying out his responsibili-
11 ties under this title and shall, to the extent permitted by law,
12 exercise their powers so as to encourage implementation of
13 the purposes of this title with respect to all programs appro-
14 priate for inclusion in community action programs. The
15 Director may call upon other Federal agencies for advice,
16 information, or assistance, including the establishment of
17 working groups of Federal personnel, in dealing with specific
18 problems of coordination arising under programs authorized
19 in this title. Cooperative actions or undertakings initiated
20 pursuant to this subsection may include evaluation of local
21 programs on a common or joint basis, and actions to assist
22 particular communities in overcoming problems arising out of
23 diverse Federal requirements, or in developing long-range
24 plans where justified by prior progress.

25 “(b) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Presi-

1 dent, where funds are advanced for a single project by more
2 than one Federal agency to a community action agency or
3 other agency assisted under this title, any one Federal agency
4 may be designated to act for all in administering the funds
5 advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement
6 may be established according to the proportion of funds
7 advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive
8 any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by
9 such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar re-
10 quirements of the administering agency or which the admin-
11 istering agency does not impose.

12 “(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of
13 funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State
14 agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States
15 or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents
16 of the United States for purposes of providing financial as-
17 sistance to community action agencies or other local agencies
18 in connection with specific projects or programs involving
19 the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this
20 title.

21 “SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

22 “SEC. 242. In carrying out the provisions of this title,
23 no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall
24 be made with, or provided to, any State or local public

1 agency or any private institution or organization for the
2 purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other ac-
3 tivity within a State unless a plan setting forth such pro-
4 posed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance
5 has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such
6 plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty
7 days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been re-
8 considered by the Director and found by him to be fully
9 consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the
10 purposes of this part. This section shall not, however, apply
11 to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance
12 to any institution of higher education in existence on the
13 date of the approval of this Act.

14 "FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

15 "SEC. 243. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency
16 receiving financial assistance under this title until it has sub-
17 mitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted
18 agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for per-
19 formance of any major portion of the assisted program) have
20 established an accounting system with internal controls ade-
21 quate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and relia-
22 bility of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency
23 and encourage compliance with prescribed management poli-
24 cies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting
25 requirements as the Director may establish. The statement

1 may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly
2 licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency,
3 the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsi-
4 bility for providing required financial services to that agency.

5 “(b) Within three months after the effective date of a
6 grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or
7 agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a pre-
8 liminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy
9 of the accounting system and internal controls established
10 thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement
11 referred to in paragraph (a). Promptly after the comple-
12 tion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis
13 of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether
14 the accounting systems and internal controls meet those
15 standards and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or con-
16 tract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall
17 be given not more than six months within which to establish
18 the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of fail-
19 ure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall be
20 terminated by the Director.

21 “(c) At least once annually the Director shall make or
22 cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assist-
23 ance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such
24 audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings
25 and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures

1 incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance,
2 the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by
3 appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate
4 increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any
5 grant or contract with the same agency or organization
6 which is then in effect or which is entered into within
7 twelve months after the date of disallowance.

8 “(d) The Director shall establish such other require-
9 ments and take such actions as he may deem necessary and
10 appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and
11 to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the
12 effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with
13 programs assisted under this title. These requirements and
14 actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that
15 the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial
16 assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its
17 approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to
18 promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or
19 components of community action programs receiving financial
20 assistance under this title, including provision for the periodic
21 reprogramming and supplementation of assistance previously
22 provided.

23 “SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

24 “SEC. 244. The following special limitations shall
25 apply, as indicated, to programs under this title.

1 “(1) Financial assistance under this title may in-
2 clude funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attend-
3 ance at meetings of any community action agency gov-
4 erning board, neighborhood council or committee, as
5 appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum feas-
6 ible participation of members of groups and residents of
7 areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title,
8 and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses con-
9 nected with those meetings; but those funds (or match-
10 ing non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allow-
11 ances in the case of any individual who is a Federal,
12 State, or local government employee, or an employee of
13 a community action agency, or for payment of an allow-
14 ance to any individual for attendance at more than two
15 meetings a month.

16 “(2) The Director shall issue necessary rules or
17 regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carry-
18 ing out community action program activities receiving
19 financial assistance under this title is compensated from
20 funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per
21 annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee
22 at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be
23 considered in determining whether the non-Federal con-
24 tributions requirements of section 223 have been com-
25 plied with; the Director may, however, provide in those

1 rules or regulations for exceptions covering cases where,
2 because of the need for specialized or professional skills
3 or prevailing local wage levels, application of the fore-
4 going restriction would greatly impair program effec-
5 tiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes
6 sought to be achieved.

7 “(3) No officer or employee of the Office of Eco-
8 nomic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board,
9 council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee,
10 contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a
11 program receiving financial assistance under this title;
12 but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from
13 serving on a board, council, or committee which does
14 not have any authority or powers in connection with a
15 program assisted under this title.

16 “(4) In granting financial assistance for projects
17 or activities in the field of family planning, the Director
18 shall assure that family planning services, including the
19 dissemination of family planning information and medical
20 assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-
21 income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility
22 for assistance under this part which have been established
23 by the assisted agency and who desire such information,
24 assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in
25 connection with any such financial assistance, that—

1 “(A) no individual will be provided with any
2 information, medical supervision, or supplies which
3 that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or
4 her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

5 “(B) no individual will be provided with any
6 medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has
7 voluntarily requested such medical supervision or
8 supplies.

9 The use of family planning services assisted under this
10 title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services
11 from or participation in any other programs under this
12 Act.

13 “(5) No financial assistance shall be extended un-
14 der this title to provide general aid to elementary or
15 secondary education in any school or school system;
16 but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, reme-
17 dial, and other noncurricular assistance.

18 “(6) In extending assistance under this title the
19 Director shall give special consideration to programs
20 which make maximum use of existing schools, commu-
21 nity centers, settlement houses, and other facilities dur-
22 ing times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

23 “DURATION OF PROGRAM

24 “SEC. 245. The Director shall carry out the programs
25 provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June

1 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each
2 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the
3 Congress may authorize by law.”

4 AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

5 SEC. 104. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity
6 Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately un-
7 der the title heading a new part heading to read “PART A—
8 RURAL LOAN PROGRAM”, and (2) striking out the heading
9 immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof
10 a new heading to read “LOANS TO FAMILIES”.

11 (b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as
12 follows:

13 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

14 “SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some
15 of the special needs of low-income rural families by estab-
16 lishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintain-
17 ing their income and living standards.”

18 (c) Section 302 (a) of such Act is amended by insert-
19 ing the word “principal” after the word “aggregate”.

20 (d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI
21 thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as
22 section 306, and amended by striking out “titles III of this
23 Act” in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu
24 thereof “this part”.

1 (e) Part B of title III of such Act is amended to read
2 as follows:

3 "PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEA-
4 SONALLY EMPLOYED, FARMWORKERS AND THEIR
5 FAMILIES

6 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

7 "SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to assist migrant
8 and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve
9 their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a
10 productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly com-
11 plex and technological society.

12 "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

13 "SEC. 312. (a) The Director may provide financial as-
14 sistance to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit
15 institutions and cooperatives in developing and carrying out
16 programs to fulfill the purpose of this part.

17 "(b) Programs assisted under this part may include
18 projects or activities—

19 "(1) to meet the immediate needs of migrant and
20 seasonal farmworkers and their families, such as day
21 care for children, education, health services, improved
22 housing and sanitation, legal advice and representation,
23 and consumer training and counseling;

24 "(2) to promote increased community acceptance

1 or migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families;
2 and

3 “(3) to equip unskilled migrant and seasonal farm-
4 workers through education and training to meet the
5 changing demands in agricultural employment brought
6 about by technological advancement and to take advan-
7 tage of opportunities available to improve their well-
8 being and self-sufficiency by gaining regular or perma-
9 nent employment or by participating in available
10 Government training programs.

11 “LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

12 “SEC. 313. (a) Assistance shall not be extended under
13 this part unless the Director determines that the applicant
14 will maintain its prior level of effort in similar activities.

15 “(b) The Director shall establish necessary procedures
16 or requirements to assure that programs under this part are
17 carried on in coordination with other programs or activities
18 providing assistance to the persons and groups served.

19 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION

20 “SEC. 314. (a) The Director may provide directly or
21 through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, such tech-
22 nical assistance or training of personnel as may be required
23 to implement effectively the purposes of this title.

24 “(b) The Director shall provide for necessary evalua-

1 tion of projects under this title and may, through grants or
2 contracts, secure independent evaluation for this purpose.”

3 AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND
4 COORDINATION

5 SEC. 105. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Economic Oppor-
6 tunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “four” in
7 the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof “six”.

8 (b) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as
9 follows:

10 “DEFINITIONS

11 “SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

12 “(1) the term ‘State’ means a State, the Com-
13 monwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia,
14 Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for
15 purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning
16 of ‘State’ shall also include the Trust Territory of the
17 Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 223
18 of this Act this term means only a State or the District
19 of Columbia. The term ‘United States’ when used in
20 a geographical sense includes all those places named in
21 the previous sentence, and all other places continental
22 or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United
23 States;

24 “(2) the term ‘financial assistance’ when used in

1 titles, I, II, and III-B includes assistance advanced by
2 grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the
3 procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services;
4 and

5 “(3) the term ‘permanent resident of the United
6 States’ when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any
7 native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United
8 States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee sub-
9 sequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of
10 sections 214 (a) or 212 (d) (5), respectively, or any
11 person admitted as a conditional entrant under section
12 203 (a) (7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act.”

13 (c) Section 610-1 (a) of such Act is amended by
14 inserting the words “a substantial number of the” immedi-
15 ately before the word “persons” the second and third time
16 that word appears.

17 (d) Section 616 of such Act is amended to read as
18 follows:

19 “TRANSFER OF FUNDS

20 “SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appro-
21 priations for any program or activity under this Act or any
22 Act authorizing appropriations for such program or activity,
23 not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or
24 allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling
25 the Director to carry out any such program or activity under

1 the Act may be transferred and used by the Director for the
 2 purpose of carrying out any other such program or activity
 3 under the Act; but no such transfer shall result in increasing
 4 the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity
 5 by more than 10 per centum.”

6 (e) Title VI of such Act is amended by—

7 (1) striking out section 604;

8 (2) striking out the heading “PART B—COORDI-
 9 NATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS” and sections
 10 611, 612, 613, and 614; and

11 (3) inserting at the end thereof a new part B to
 12 read as follows:

13 “PART B—COORDINATION

14 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

15 “SEC. 630. This part establishes an Economic Oppor-
 16 tunity Council, provides for an information center, and pre-
 17 scribes certain duties and responsibilities. Its purpose is to
 18 promote better coordination among all programs related to
 19 this Act, with a view to making those programs more effec-
 20 tive in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State and
 21 local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to varying
 22 local problems and conditions, stimulating new and more
 23 imaginative ways of combining complementary Federal re-
 24 sources in the solution of specific problems, and generally
 25 improving cooperation and communication among all levels

1 of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related
2 to the purposes of this Act.

3 "ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

4 "SEC. 631. (a) There is established an Economic Op-
5 portunity Council. The Council shall include the Director
6 who shall be Chairman, the Attorney General, the Secretaries
7 of Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor,
8 Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban
9 Development, the Administrator of the Small Business
10 Administration, the Chairman of the Council of Economic
11 Advisers, and the Director of Selective Service. The Presi-
12 dent, in his discretion, may from time to time revise the
13 membership of the Council to take account of changes in
14 functions or otherwise assure representation on the Council
15 that will best promote the purposes of this part. Each mem-
16 ber shall designate an alternative to sit in his stead in the
17 event of his unavoidable absence.

18 "(b) It shall be the responsibility of the Council to
19 consult with and advise the President and the Director in
20 carrying out their functions, including the coordination of
21 antipoverty efforts by all segments of the government. In
22 doing so, the Council shall—

23 "(1) advise generally on the coordination of Fed-
24 eral programs related to this Act;

1 “(2) review and make recommendations, as appro-
2 priate, with respect to major policy issues and questions
3 of basic priorities involving the coordination of programs
4 related to this Act;

5 “(3) initiate, consider, recommend, and, to the ex-
6 tent feasible, arrange for the carrying out of specific
7 actions or projects designed to improve coordination
8 among programs related to this Act; and

9 “(4) provide general guidance and advice in con-
10 nection with the operation of the information center
11 provided for in this part and assist the Director in mak-
12 ing the center more effective.

13 “(c) The Council may be provided a staff by the Di-
14 rector. Employees of other executive departments and agen-
15 cies may be detailed to the Council from time to time for
16 temporary assistance.

17 “(d) As directed by the President, or from time to time
18 as it deems appropriate, the Council shall report to the Presi-
19 dent concerning specific actions which it has taken, or pro-
20 poses to take, in carrying out its responsibilities. To the
21 extent appropriate, a report of the Council’s activities shall
22 be reflected in the Director’s annual report to the President
23 and the Congress or in a separate report to the President
24 for transmittal to the Congress.

1 “RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

2 “SEC. 632. In addition to his other powers under this
3 Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the anti-
4 poverty efforts of all Federal agencies, the Director shall—

5 “(1) undertake special studies of specific coordina-
6 tion problems at the request of the President or the
7 Council, or on his own initiative; and

8 “(2) carry on a continuing evaluation of all activi-
9 ties under this Act, and consult with interested agencies
10 and groups, including State agencies described in sec-
11 tion 231 of this Act and the National Advisory Council,
12 with a view to identifying coordination problems may
13 warrant consideration by the Council or the President
14 and, to the extent feasible or appropriate, initiate action
15 for overcoming those problems, either through the Office
16 of Economic Opportunity or in conjunction with other
17 Federal, State, or local agencies.

18 “COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

19 “SEC. 633. (a) Federal agencies administering pro-
20 grams related to this Act shall—

21 “(1) cooperate with the Director and with the
22 Council in carrying out their duties and responsibilities;
23 and

24 “(2) carry out their programs and exercise their
25 functions so as to assist in carrying out the provisions

1 and purposes of this Act, to the fullest extent permitted
2 by other applicable law.

3 “(b) The Council and the Director may call upon Fed-
4 eral agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and
5 other materials as they deem necessary to discharge their
6 responsibilities under this Act.

7 “(c) The President may direct that particular programs
8 and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of Federal
9 agencies shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent
10 with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support
11 of programs authorized under this Act.

12 “COMBINATIONS AMONG PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

13 “SEC. 634. In order to encourage efficiencies, close
14 unnecessary service gaps, and generally promote more effec-
15 tive administration, the Director shall require, to the fullest
16 extent feasible, that projects or programs assisted under this
17 Act be carried on so as to supplement one another, or where
18 appropriate other related programs or projects, and be in-
19 cluded within or otherwise carried on in combination with
20 community action programs. In the case of other programs
21 related to this Act, the heads of the Federal agencies respon-
22 sible for those programs shall, to the extent permitted by
23 law, similarly provide assistance for projects and activities in
24 a manner which encourages combinations with other related

1 projects and activities, where appropriate, and with commu-
2 nity action programs. The Economic Opportunity Council
3 shall, in carrying out its responsibilities under this part, make
4 a continuing review of the operation of this section with a
5 view to (1) determining particular groups of programs
6 which, because of their objectives, or similarities in target
7 groups or areas, are especially appropriate for combined or
8 closely coordinated operation at the State or local level, and
9 making recommendations accordingly to the President or
10 appropriate Federal officials; (2) evaluating Federal agency
11 procedures for carrying out this section, and developing or
12 recommending additional or common procedures, as appro-
13 priate; and (3) determining whether, and to what extent,
14 consolidations of Federal programs may be justified and
15 making recommendations respecting such consolidations to
16 the Director and the President.

17 "INFORMATION CENTER

18 "SEC. 635. (a) The Director shall establish and oper-
19 ate an information center for the purpose of insuring that
20 maximum use is made of Federal programs related to this
21 Act and that information concerning those programs and
22 other relevant information is readily available to public
23 officials and other interested persons. The Director shall
24 collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute informa-
25 tion as described above, either free of charge or by sale at

1 cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's
2 account as an offset of that cost), and may make arrange-
3 ments and pay for any printing and binding without regard
4 to the provisions of any other law or regulations. In con-
5 nection with operation of the center, the Director may carry
6 on research or studies concerning the improvement of in-
7 formation systems in support of the purposes of this Act, the
8 adequacy of existing data, ways in which data generated on
9 the State and local level may be incorporated into Federal
10 information systems, and methods by which data may be
11 made more readily available to State and local officials or
12 used to further coordination objectives.

13 “(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a
14 current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to in-
15 dividual and community improvement. He may also make
16 grants, from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this
17 Act, to States and communities to establish information
18 service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribu-
19 tion of information required to further the purposes of this
20 Act.

21 “(c) In order to assure that all appropriate officials are
22 kept fully informed of programs related to this Act, and
23 that maximum use is made of those programs, the Director
24 shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to
25 State and local agencies of all current information, including

1 administrative rules, regulations, and guidelines, required
2 by those agencies for the effective performance of their
3 responsibilities.

4 "PROHIBITION

5 "SEC. 636. In order to assure that existing Federal
6 agencies are used to the fullest extent possible in carrying
7 out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry
8 out this Act shall be used to establish any new department
9 or office when the intended function is being performed by
10 an existing department or office.

11 "SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: TRAINING PROGRAMS

12 "SEC. 637. (a) It shall be the responsibility of the
13 Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health,
14 Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other depart-
15 ments and agencies concerned, acting through such pro-
16 cedures or mechanisms as the President may prescribe, to
17 provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and
18 appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all
19 programs and activities within the executive branch of the
20 Government relating to the training of individuals for the
21 purpose of improving or restoring employability.

22 " (b) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agree-
23 ments as may be necessary or appropriate (which may in-
24 clude arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

25 " (1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-

1 State employment service provides and develops its
2 capacity for providing maximum support for the pro-
3 grams described in subsection (a) ; and

4 “ (2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the
5 Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Di-
6 rector of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the
7 head of any other Federal agency administering a train-
8 ing program, such employment information as will facil-
9 itate the placement of individuals being trained.

10 “DEFINITIONS

11 “SEC. 638. As used in this part, ‘programs related to
12 this Act’ and ‘coordination’ shall include the programs and
13 actions described in this section:

14 “ (1) ‘Programs related to this Act’ include pro-
15 grams under this Act and all Federal or federally assisted
16 programs which have objectives which are, in whole
17 or substantial part, complementary to the purposes of
18 this Act, or which provide resources which may be
19 used in combination with resources under this Act to
20 assist in achieving any of the purposes of this Act.

21 “ (2) ‘Coordination’ includes, but is not limited to—

22 “ (A) actions to improve the common effective-
23 ness of programs in reaching and serving the poor,
24 such as actions: to extend services to new areas,
25 provide them in a common place, or structure them

1 so that they are more readily accepted or widely
2 utilized; to eliminate procedures or requirements that
3 may be inappropriate for or result in unnecessary
4 hardship to disadvantaged persons with limited
5 education or other special handicaps; to establish
6 common eligibility standards among programs serv-
7 ing substantially similar groups or operating in the
8 same areas; or to develop methods of operation or
9 administration that will provide new employment
10 incentives or opportunities for the poor;

11 “(B) actions to promote better use at the State
12 or local level of Federal assistance available under
13 diverse programs, such as actions to establish pro-
14 cedures for cooperation among State or local agencies
15 seeking assistance from different Federal sources
16 with a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication
17 and service gaps and promoting common or comple-
18 mentary priorities; or to modify or improve tech-
19 nical or administrative requirements imposed by
20 different Federal agencies that may operate to
21 increase unnecessarily the burdens of State or local
22 agencies, minimize their opportunities for the imag-
23 inative use of Federal assistance, or discourage their
24 cooperation with one another;

25 “(C) actions to promote simplification and ef-

1 iciencies through the joint or combined use of
2 Federal resources, such as actions to develop new
3 methods of processing requests for assistance or
4 granting assistance that will enable Federal agencies
5 more generally to use resources jointly in support of
6 common objectives; to establish common priorities
7 for purposes of program planning, research and
8 demonstration activities; and to effect combinations
9 among or redirect Federal programs or activities for
10 the purpose of eliminating unnecessary duplication;

11 “(D) actions to improve communication and
12 general cooperation, such as actions to strengthen
13 ties among regional offices of different Federal agen-
14 cies and among such offices and other regional agen-
15 cies or organizations; to develop and improve proce-
16 dures by which Federal agencies may act together
17 in promulgating or making available items of in-
18 formation, including information as to the avail-
19 ability and allocation of funds, which are closely re-
20 lated to one another for purposes of State or local
21 planning and budgeting; or to develop procedures
22 by which State and local agencies may be afforded
23 new opportunities to participate in Federal policy
24 decisions, including decisions on recommended leg-

1 isolation, affecting their capacity to operate efficiently
2 and effectively.”

3 AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

4 SEC. 106. (a) Title VII of the Economic Opportunity
5 Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

6 “TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CER-
7 TAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

8 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

9 “SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to provide in-
10 centives to welfare recipients to participate in programs
11 under this Act which are designed to enable them to become
12 self-supporting, and to complete such programs and become
13 self-supporting within a reasonable period of time.

14 “STATE PLANS

15 “SEC. 702. Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I,
16 IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, a
17 State plan approved under any such title shall include pro-
18 visions consistent with the rules prescribed or under this title.

19 “DEFINITIONS

20 “SEC. 703. For the purposes of this title—

21 “(a) ‘Public assistance’ shall mean any aid or assist-
22 ance payable pursuant to a State plan approved under title I,
23 IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

24 “(b) ‘Trainee’ shall mean any person enrolled in any
25 program under title I, II, or III-B of this Act or employed

1 in any such program as a resident nonprofessional or in any
2 other combined work-and-training capacity.

3 “(c) ‘Qualifying income’ shall mean (1) any amount
4 paid as wages under title I of this Act to a trainee in a pro-
5 gram described in paragraph (1) of section 121 of the Act
6 (relating to Neighborhood Youth Corps programs for youth
7 attending school) ; (2) any amount paid under this Act as
8 wages, training allowance, or stipend to any other trainee
9 during his first eighteen months as such a trainee; and
10 (3) the net income derived, during the first eighteen months
11 following initial receipt of assistance under title III-A of
12 this Act, by any assisted family from the assisted farm or
13 nonagricultural enterprise.

14 “(d) ‘Poverty line’ shall mean an amount of monthly
15 income determined by the Director, representing an approxi-
16 mation of the minimum level of income which is necessary
17 to support a family of given size so that it can live out of
18 poverty.

19 “ATTRIBUTION OF INCOME

20 “SEC. 704. Unless otherwise provided in regulations pre-
21 scribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
22 no payment made under this Act to or on behalf of any
23 trainee shall be regarded as income or resources of any other
24 individual under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X,
25 XIV, XVI, or XIX except to the extent that the payment

1 is made available to or used for the benefit of such other
2 individual.

3 "AMOUNT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

4 "SEC. 705. (a) The amount of public assistance payable
5 for any month to any person having qualifying income shall
6 be the higher of (1) the amount determined under the State
7 plan without regard to this section, or (2) the amount deter-
8 mined under subsection (b).

9 "(b) The amount of public assistance which is payable
10 for any month to any person who receives qualifying income
11 shall be computed, for purposes of this subsection, as follows:

12 "(1) The amount of public assistance, excluding
13 assistance for medical care, shall be computed under the
14 State plan as if the qualifying income had not been re-
15 ceived (and without any provision for expenses con-
16 nected with earning the qualifying income).

17 "(2) The qualifying income for the month shall be
18 converted into a percentage of the monthly poverty line.

19 "(3) The amount of public assistance payable
20 (other than assistance for medical care) shall be the
21 amount determined under clause (1) above, reduced
22 by the percentage determined under clause (2) or, if
23 the State plan so provides, by eight-tenths of that
24 percentage.

25 "(4) Assistance for medical care shall be provided

1 in accordance with the State plan. In States where
2 the plan provides that assistance for medical care de-
3 pends upon eligibility for other public assistance, such
4 eligibility shall be determined in accordance with this
5 subsection.

6 “(c) If more than one member of a family receives
7 qualifying income, the qualifying income of all members of
8 the family shall be aggregated in determining the percentage
9 referred to in subsection (b) (2). The foregoing sentence
10 shall not apply in cases in which its application would be
11 inconsistent with section 704.

12 “SAVINGS PROVISION

13 “SEC. 706. If, at the time the rules prescribed in section
14 705 become effective in his State, a trainee’s public assist-
15 ance is being computed in accordance with the prior version
16 of this title, it shall continue to be so computed until (1)
17 his rights under the prior version expire, or (2) he com-
18 pletes his participation in the particular program in which
19 he is a trainee, whichever occurs sooner. Thereafter, if he
20 receives additional qualifying income, his public assistance
21 shall be determined in accordance with section 705.”

22 (b) In the case of any State whose State plan meets
23 the requirements of section 701 of the Economic Oppor-
24 tunity Act of 1964 in effect prior to the amendment made
25 by subsection (2) of this section, no funds to which the State

1 is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or
2 XIX of the Social Security Act shall be withheld prior to
3 January 1, 1968, as a result of such amendment; nor shall
4 funds be withheld from any such State by reason of any
5 action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents the
6 State from complying with the requirements of such amend-
7 ment until the first day of the fourth month after the State
8 legislature next adjourns following the effective date of this
9 Act.

10 VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

11 SEC. 107. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act
12 of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

13 "TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE
14 PROGRAMS

15 "VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

16 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

17 "SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-
18 time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-
19 term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer
20 programs, together with other powers and responsibilities
21 designed to assist in the development and coordination of
22 volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and
23 supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and
24 enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups,
25 including elderly and retired Americans, to perform mean-

ingful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant workers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement.

“PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

“AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

“SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to work—

“(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

“(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit

1 mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in
2 their construction or operation by Federal funds; and

3 “(3) in connection with programs or activities au-
4 thorized, supported, or of a character eligible for
5 assistance under this Act.

6 “(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section
7 shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions
8 on political activities that appropriately recognize the special
9 status of volunteers living among the persons or groups
10 served by programs to which they have been assigned) as
11 the Director may determine; but volunteers under this part
12 shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without
13 the consent of the Governor.

14 "TERMS OF SERVICE

15 “SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be re-
16 quired to make a full-time personal commitment to combating
17 poverty. This shall include a commitment to live among
18 and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain
19 available for service without regard to regular working hours,
20 at all times during their term of service, except for author-
21 ized periods of leave.

22 “(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for
23 one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to train-
24 ing. The Director may, however, allow persons who are
25 unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as

1 volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than
2 two months where he determines that this more limited
3 service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

4 “(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and sub-
5 scribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by
6 section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001
7 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with
8 respect to that oath or affirmation.

9 “SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

10 “SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to
11 volunteers under this part while they are in training and on
12 assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month
13 during the volunteer’s first year of service. He may provide
14 a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons
15 who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance
16 with standards prescribed by him, have been designated
17 volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills.
18 The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel
19 (including travel to and from the place of training), and
20 leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment,
21 subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other
22 support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their
23 needs.

24 “(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of
25 a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances

1 the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend,
2 or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the
3 event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount
4 of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the
5 provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5
6 U.S.C. 5582).

7 “(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educa-
8 tional and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent
9 volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience
10 which they have derived from their training and service in
11 the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty
12 as members of the helping professions.

13 “PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER
14 PROGRAMS

15 “COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

16 “SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs
17 designed to expand opportunities for persons to partici-
18 pate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for
19 shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment
20 under section 810, and in their home or nearby communi-
21 ties, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination
22 of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or
23 arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical,
24 or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are
25 undertaken in connection with these programs. These

1 projects may include, without limitation, activities designed
2 (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to partici-
3 pate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted
4 under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs
5 designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2)
6 to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional,
7 or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for
8 the development or betterment of neighborhoods or areas
9 having especially large concentrations of the poor, with par-
10 ticular emphasis upon helping residents of those neighbor-
11 hoods or areas to develop the competence necessary to take
12 advantage of public and private resources which would not
13 otherwise be available or used for those programs; and (3)
14 to assist existing national and local agencies relying upon
15 or in need of volunteers to obtain volunteer services more
16 readily, or to provide specialized short-term training, with
17 particular emphasis on agencies serving the most seriously
18 disadvantaged, operating in areas of the most concentrated
19 poverty, or having similar critical needs.

20 “(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section
21 shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such
22 other support or allowances as the Director determines, pur-
23 suant to regulations, are required because of unusual or
24 special circumstances affecting the project.

1 “(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable
2 as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any pro-
3 gram or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act,
4 shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the
5 Director under this section in providing for or assisting in
6 the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such per-
7 son.

8 “SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

9 “SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or
10 provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs
11 designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of pro-
12 viding volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer
13 participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not
14 to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated
15 from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal
16 year may be used for programs under this section.

17 “PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

18 “COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

19 “SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to
20 coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title
21 with one another, with community action programs, and
22 with other related Federal, State, local, and national pro-
23 grams. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible,
24 actions to promote service by volunteers or former volun-
25 teers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in

1 providing necessary support to programs under part B,
2 and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or
3 short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A
4 as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director
5 shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State,
6 local, and national agencies responsible for programs related
7 to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging
8 greater use of volunteer services in those programs and
9 establishing in connection with them systematic procedures
10 for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orienta-
11 tion or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant
12 to this part.

13 “PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

14 “SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall
15 take necessary steps, including the development of special
16 projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest feasible
17 participation of older persons in the various programs and
18 activities authorized under this title.

19 “APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

20 “SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b),
21 volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal
22 employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws
23 relating to Federal employment.

24 “(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance
25 or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services

1 or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter
2 III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, per-
3 sons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Gov-
4 ernment, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same
5 extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116 (a)
6 (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of
7 the computation described in 116 (a) (2) (B) the monthly
8 pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under
9 the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5,
10 United States Code.

11 "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

12 "SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations
13 to assure that service under this title is limited to activities
14 which would not otherwise be performed and which will not
15 result in the displacement of employed workers or impair
16 existing contracts for service.

17 "(b) All support, including transportation provided to
18 volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest
19 possible cost consistent with the effective operations of
20 volunteer programs.

21 "(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are
22 assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any
23 volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any
24 compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such
25 agency or organization.

1 “DURATION OF PROGRAM

2 “SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs
3 provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June
4 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each
5 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the
6 Congress may authorize by law.”

7 TITLE II—SUMMER CAMPS FOR DISADVAN-
8 TAGED CHILDREN

9 SHORT TITLE

10 SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the “Summer Camp
11 Act of 1967”.

12 FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

13 SEC. 202. Millions of acres of forest and park lands
14 throughout the Nation are the property of all the people.
15 Yet the circumstances of poverty frequently prevent the
16 utilization of these lands by those most in need, particularly
17 disadvantaged children who would benefit from outdoor and
18 camping experiences. It is the purpose of this title to pro-
19 vide and assist in the provision of camp facilities which per-
20 mit greater use of such public lands under Federal, State,
21 and local administration in behalf of these children.

22 BASIC AUTHORITY

23 SEC. 203. (a) The Director of the Office of Economic
24 Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the “Director”)
25 may allocate funds to other Federal agencies, or extend

1 financial assistance to State or local public agencies, to enable
2 them to provide camp facilities for use by disadvantaged chil-
3 dren. The following basic conditions shall apply to the
4 exercise of this authority—

5 (1) the facilities (except as may be necessary in
6 connection with access roads, utility lines, or similar in-
7 stallations) must be on public lands;

8 (2) the facilities must be so located in relation to
9 population centers as to permit their efficient, meaningful,
10 and substantial use in connection with camping pro-
11 grams, projects, or activities for disadvantaged children;
12 and

13 (3) the facilities must be provided and operated
14 subject to a use plan, conforming to the requirements of
15 section 205, which provides reasonable assurance of
16 their continuing availability, under the sponsorship of
17 one or more public or private nonprofit agencies, for
18 such camping programs, projects, or activities.

19 ALLOCATION AND USE OF FUNDS

20 SEC. 204. (a) Funds appropriated under this title may
21 be allocated by the Director to the Secretaries of Agricul-
22 ture, the Interior, or to the Army, to pay the cost of camp
23 facilities on public lands under their administration, or to the
24 head of any other Federal agency responsible for the admin-
25 istration of public lands which are determined by the Director

1 and the head of that agency to be appropriate for use in
2 providing camp facilities pursuant to this Act. Funds may
3 also be provided, by grant or contract, to State or local public
4 agencies responsible for administration of public lands and
5 having the legal, technical, and financial capacity to under-
6 take projects for the provision of camp facilities in accord-
7 ance with this title.

8 (b) Funds allocated to a Federal agency, or made avail-
9 able for any State or local project, may be used for—

10 (1) the construction, renovation, or improvement
11 (including furnishing and equipping) of camp facilities;

12 (2) the purchase or lease of privately owned facili-
13 ties on public lands which are or may be made suitable
14 for use as camp facilities; and

15 (3) essential maintenance and supervision of camp
16 facilities to the extent, as may be agreed upon by the Di-
17 rector and the agency concerned, that such maintenance
18 and supervision is not otherwise available or cannot
19 otherwise be reasonably provided.

20 (c) Funds allocated or made available under this title
21 may not be used for the administration or operation of any
22 camping program or project, nor may they be used for the
23 purchase of land; but this shall not preclude their use in
24 acquiring necessary rights in connection with access roads,
25 utility lines, or similar installations.

USE PLANS

1
2 SEC. 205. (a) Funds shall not be allocated and used
3 by a Federal agency for any facility, and the Director shall
4 not extend financial assistance to any State or local agency
5 project, unless the facility or project is covered by a use plan
6 or agreement approved by the Director in accordance with
7 this section. In the case of facilities to be provided by a
8 Federal agency, the plan shall contain such information and
9 understandings concerning the character of the facility, the
10 type and extent of use to be made of it, the number and
11 nature of and procedure for selecting sponsoring organiza-
12 tions, conformity with the rules and regulations of the admin-
13 istering agency, and other matters, as may be agreed upon
14 by the Director and the head of that agency. In the case of
15 projects of State or local public bodies, the plan shall contain,
16 at a minimum, information and commitments necessary to
17 assure—

18 (1) that the facilities will be adequate, and reason-
19 able in cost, in relation to their proposed use;

20 (2) that the facilities and their proposed use will
21 comply with all applicable laws and regulations and
22 be consistent with any applicable plans or planning,
23 including any statewide outdoor recreation plans ap-
24 proved pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation
25 Act of 1965;

1 (3) that the facilities will be available for use in
2 accordance with this title over an appropriate minimum
3 period, consistent with their cost, and that they will not
4 be converted to any other use during that period except
5 with the approval of the Director and subject to such
6 additional conditions or requirements (which may in-
7 clude required repayment of all or part of the financial
8 assistance, as determined after opportunity for hearing)
9 as the Director may prescribe;

10 (4) that the agency seeking financial assistance
11 will retain sufficient continuing control over the facilities
12 to assure their continuing use in accordance with this
13 title over the applicable minimum period; and

14 (5) that there are public or private nonprofit
15 sponsoring organizations (which may include the appli-
16 cant agency) which are able and willing to assume
17 responsibility for operating or coordinating the operation
18 of the facilities so as to assure their effective and efficient
19 use for camping programs for disadvantaged children,
20 and that there are adequate methods or procedures for
21 selecting those sponsoring organizations.

22 (b) The Director, after consultation with the heads of
23 interested Federal agencies, may by regulation prescribe
24 additional or supplementary requirements or criteria for
25 use plans. Such regulations may include descriptions of dif-

1 ferent types of camping programs for which facilities pro-
2 vided or assisted under this title may be used, general
3 standards for these various types of programs, and require-
4 ments or procedures for selecting sponsoring organizations
5 in accordance with their capacity to provide or arrange for
6 the staff, health care, food, transportation, and other sup-
7 portive services needed for such programs. The regulations
8 may also require specific approval of sponsoring organiza-
9 tions by the Director.

10 USE OF FACILITIES BY OTHER THAN THE DISADVANTAGED

11 SEC. 206. Facilities provided or assisted under this title
12 shall not be used for groups other than disadvantaged chil-
13 dren unless it is determined, by the Director or in accord-
14 ance with regulations promulgated by him establishing
15 criteria for such determinations, that the facilities would
16 otherwise not be adequately utilized, that it is not reason-
17 ably possible to expand their use for disadvantaged children,
18 and that use by other organizations or groups would not
19 preclude or be inconsistent with the fullest practicable use
20 of the facilities for disadvantaged children. The Director
21 shall consult with the Federal agencies concerned and, where
22 feasible, with interested State and local agencies in issuing
23 regulations under this section. Those regulations may pro-
24 vide for use by groups other than disadvantaged children on
25 a fee basis, and may require in the case of any State or local

1 public agencies that fees so collected be applied in reduc-
2 tion of the amount of financial assistance provided under
3 this title.

4 EMPLOYMENT OF LOW-INCOME PERSONS

5 SEC. 207. To the extent feasible, the Director shall en-
6 courage the provision, maintenance, supervision, and use of
7 camp facilities in a manner that will promote new or addi-
8 tional employment or training opportunities for low-income
9 individuals, including individuals enrolled in the Job Corps,
10 the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other programs de-
11 signed to improve or restore employability.

12 LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

13 SEC. 208. Financial assistance under this title to any
14 State or local public agency for any project or activity shall
15 not exceed 80 per centum of the approved cost of such project
16 or activity. Nor shall the Director provide such assistance to
17 any such agency unless he satisfies himself that the prior
18 level of agency expenditures in connection with other facil-
19 ities available to disadvantaged children has not been and
20 will not be reduced and that contributions or expenditures
21 in connection with those other facilities will not be diminished
22 in order to provide any non-Federal contributions required
23 under this section. Non-Federal contributions required by
24 this section may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, includ-
25 ing but not limited to materials, equipment, and services.

LABOR STANDARDS

1
2 SEC. 209. All laborers and mechanics employed by con-
3 tractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration,
4 or repair, including painting and decorating, of projects,
5 buildings, and works which are federally assisted under this
6 title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevail-
7 ing on similar construction in the locality as determined
8 by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-
9 Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The
10 Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor
11 standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorgan-
12 ization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64
13 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934,
14 as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276 (c)).

GENERAL PROVISIONS

15
16 SEC. 210. To the extent necessary or appropriate to
17 carry out the provisions of this title, the Director shall have
18 the powers and duties conferred upon him by section 602
19 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, except that he
20 may make arrangements with, reimburse, or delegate any
21 powers to, the heads of other Federal agencies, including
22 agencies to which funds are allocated under section 204 (a),
23 and authorize redelegations, without regard to the provisions
24 of section 602 (d) of such Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 211. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term “camp facilities” includes permanent or semipermanent structures, sanitary, water, cooking, electrical or similar installations or fixtures, access roads and utility lines and installations necessary for adequate development of a site, recreational installations appropriate to a campsite, and such other furnishings, equipment, installations, or structures as may be required to provide a site appropriate for regular or repeated use in connection with camping programs for disadvantaged children;

(2) The term “State or local public agency” means a State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity or public body, an Indian tribe, or two or more such entities, bodies, or tribes, having necessary control over public lands and otherwise authorized to undertake the commitments required pursuant to this title with respect to any camp facility;

(3) The term “public lands” means those lands under the ownership, control, or administration of Federal, State, or local public agencies or Indian tribes;

(4) The term “sponsoring organization” means a welfare, youth, charitable, church, or labor organization,

1 a school, civic club, or community action agency estab-
2 lished pursuant to title II of the Economic Opportunity
3 Act of 1964, or any other public or private nonprofit
4 agency (other than a political party) which has au-
5 thority to operate, administer, or coordinate camping
6 programs for disadvantaged children using facilities pro-
7 vided under this title; and

8 (5) The term "disadvantaged children" means
9 children from low-income families, and includes groups
10 predominantly or principally composed of such children.

11 AUTHORIZATIONS

12 SEC. 212. For the purposes of carrying out this title,
13 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
14 \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and
15 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding
16 fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary. Sums so appro-
17 priated shall remain available until expended.

18 TITLE III—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

19 SEC. 301. (a) Whoever, being an officer, director,
20 agent, or employee of, or connected in any capacity with, any
21 agency receiving financial assistance under the Economic
22 Opportunity Act, as amended, embezzles, willfully mis-
23 applies, steals, or obtains by fraud any of the moneys, funds,
24 assets, or property which are the subject of a grant or con-
25 tract of assistance pursuant to the Economic Opportunity

1 Act, as amended, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or
2 imprisoned for not more than two years, or both; but if the
3 amount so embezzled, misapplied, stolen, or obtained by
4 fraud does not exceed \$100, he shall be fined not more than
5 \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

6 (b) Whoever, by threat of procuring dismissal of any
7 person from employment or of refusal to employ or refusal
8 to renew a contract of employment in connection with a
9 grant or contract of assistance under the Economic Oppor-
10 tunity Act, as amended, induces any person to give up
11 any money or thing of any value to any person (including
12 such grantee agency), shall be fined not more than \$1,000
13 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 8311

A BILL

To provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes.

By Mr. PERKINS

APRIL 10, 1967

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

over the seminaries. According to Church authorities, the regime had heightened their demands from the right to inspect seminary premises to inspection of textbooks and checking on the teaching of non-theological subjects. Reluctantly the Church submitted to these demands. Early in 1965, the State requested the right to place its representatives on examination boards and even ask questions to students being examined. The Polish bishops resisted, and in March 1965 instructed rectors not to admit state inspectors, an ecclesiastical order that was carried out. On Nov. 23, the Education Minister informed the bishops of six dioceses that proceedings had been instituted for the removal of the rectors of the six seminaries in their areas. Four days later letters were sent demanding removal of the rectors. Church authorities maintained that the bishops alone had the right to name and dismiss rectors and that no state approval was required for nomination; therefore, they appealed the order. The regime's response came on Dec. 7 advising them of proceedings to close the seminaries. In subsequent weeks Polish churchmen mounted a counter-attack against the regime from the pulpits in which they demanded the right to educate their own future leaders of the Church.

On Dec. 25, Cardinal Wysznski was described as having "defiantly" put the Government on notice that the Roman Catholic Church would not willingly yield to demands to close some seminaries. He affirmed the right of the Church to educate its future priests, not, as he said, "the Ministry of Education, officials of the Office for Religious Affairs, security services or even the police." "In the education of future priests," he declared, "no one shall replace" the Church. Despite his stern words, the Cardinal addressed season's wishes to the political leaders of Poland and voiced a hope that they would assure the Church of all its rights and liberties.

On Dec. 27, the regime made public its case against the Church on closing the seminaries in what was described as an "uncompromising" statement published in *Trybuna Ludu*, but it declared there was no intention to extend inspection to theological teaching.

On Jan. 12, 1967, it was reported from Warsaw that the Church-State dispute had suddenly taken a more hopeful turn when representatives of the Episcopate and the State convened a joint commission for regulating their differences. A factor in easing tensions was said to be the arrival of a new emissary from the Vatican who in secret talks was believed to have tried to prepare fresh negotiations between the regime and the Vatican. This "cautious search" for a reconciliation between Warsaw and the Vatican was said to have broken down as a result of the bishops' so-called "forgiveness" letter of invitation to the German bishops and the subsequent cancellation of the Pope's pilgrimage to Czestochowa to celebrate the millenium.

December 20, 1966: The Polish Communist party was said to be considering "sterner" measures to be taken against dissatisfied intellectuals. Party meetings with writers and other intellectuals disclosed a considerable current of criticism and hostility against the party line on Polish cultural freedom. A meeting of a cell at the Writers' Association on Dec. 9, for example, was described as being "tempestuous."

January 19, 1967: Soviet leaders Brezhnev, Kosygin and President Nicolai Podgorny conferred with Polish leaders somewhere in Poland during the week for policy discussions on what was believed to have related to Polish-Soviet relations with Communist China, the West and the Roman Catholic Church. The timing of the announcement from the official Polish news agency PAP, it was said, seemed to reflect the growing uneasiness of the Soviet Union over Chinese affairs and to confirm the impression of diplomatic and Polish sources that the meeting concentrated on serious policy questions.

The Russians have been seeking Polish support in their conflict with Peking.

January 27, 1967: Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki concluded two days of official talks in Paris with a call on President de Gaulle. Subsequently, Rapacki declared that he had a better understanding of French policy. But, the two countries have held differing views on the essential problem which concerned them, namely, the German question. The French regarded a potentially dangerous strain existing in Europe so long as Germany remained divided and thus Paris sought a thaw in East-West relations that would permit reunification. On the other hand, the Poles sought the recognition of the GDR as a legally existing state, not only by the French but also West Germany. In conversations with French leaders, Rapacki suggested that a Pan-European security Conference be convened, an idea the Soviets unsuccessfully proposed to the French. The French held the view that such a meeting could be convoked only after a thaw in relations but was not a means for inducing a thaw. According to a report from Paris published in the *Washington Post*, Rapacki also brought up his 1959 "Rapacki Plan" on denuclearization of Central Europe, long regarded as being an unfruitful proposal even in Poland.

February 9, 1967: Gomulka attacked West Germany as nations of the Warsaw Pact opened a conference in Warsaw. The establishing of relations between West Germany and the East European states, he said, "will not improve in the slightest degree the climate in Europe unless the West German government gives up its claims against the vital interests of the Socialist states." Poland and East Germany, it was said, have taken the "hardest line" toward West Germany. In contrast, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria have been moving toward a closer relationship with the Bonn Government.

February 10, 1967: Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Pact countries ended a three-day meeting intended to "soothe the disquiet of East Germany and Poland," as the press report said, over the lively interest of their allies in establishing closer relations with West Germany. The report from Warsaw said that the meeting had failed in that purpose. The communique did not repeat the minimum conditions for a rapprochement between West Germany and the Communist nations that were included in the Bucharest declaration of July 1966, namely, recognition of the existence of the GDR and West Germany; renunciation of West Germany's claim to represent all Germany; recognition of Poland's western frontier; and a pledge that West Germany be deprived of any share in control over nuclear weapons. Informed East European sources said that the purpose of the conference was to establish a closer exchange of views before moving toward relations with West Germany so as not to diminish the conditions in the Bucharest declaration. A week before, Rumania recognized West Germany, precipitating the "anguished reactions" of the GDR and Poland that led to the conference.

Sources: Deadline Data on World Affairs, the New York Times, the Washington Post.

TAIWAN'S STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE IN ASIA

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times when true friends are at such high premium and we seem to have so few, it is well to reassess the importance of those who stand fast. There should be a lesson of particular signifi-

cance in the fact that for more than a generation, we have freely bestowed our aid to nearly every country which sought it, yet only a handful of those countries now stand unashamedly beside us in the battle for freedom in South Vietnam.

Amazingly, some of the principal beneficiaries are making a profit out of trading with the enemy. Most of them simply look the other way and pretend nothing is going on, while we fight the battle which may insure freedom for them as well, in the years ahead. This amazing situation calls for reassessment of American policies. It is time to give primary consideration to the development of the economic and military resources of those countries who have clearly indicated their friendship and their willingness to be counted. Foremost among these is Taiwan, whose friendship has never been in doubt.

The Republic of China on the island of Taiwan has become, since the days of the Korean war, increasingly important to U.S. strategic interests in the Far East. This is due primarily to two interrelated factors, geography and the growth of Nationalist China's military strength. Geographically, Formosa acts as a link in the Western defense system which rings mainland China from Japan to Thailand. It currently serves as a base for the U.S. 7th Fleet operating off Communist China and has been used to service American aircraft being used in Vietnam.

Chinese Communist control of the island would seriously affect the U.S. military position in the western Pacific. Such a situation would reduce the effectiveness of Okinawa as a base serving American defense needs in Asia. A Communist Formosa would also seriously menace the Philippines—just 200 miles to the south—where this country maintains bases and where the Communist Huk movement has become active in recent months in Luzon.

The military strength of the Republic of China constitutes a factor of importance in the context of the current cold war conflict between Asian communism and the free world. To the West and particularly to the United States, the Chinese Nationalist forces represent a valuable military asset in a conflict with Communist China. The planners in Peking must also consider Taiwan in arriving at decisions affecting their country's military role in southeast Asia and Vietnam.

Nationalist China's Armed Forces currently number approximately 544,000 men. Of the four services—Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force—the Army and Air Force are the most important. The Army has a strength of 400,000, 80,000 of which are on the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. It is broken down into 23 divisions—of which two are armored—two armored Cavalry regiments, four Special Forces groups, and one parachute brigade. The Air Force, with a total strength of 82,000 men, possesses 500 combat aircraft. It has recently begun to replace its old F-86 Sabrejet with more modern U.S.-built F-100A's, F-104G's, and F-5A's. In past combat experience against Communist China's Air Force, the Nationalists have given an excellent account of themselves.

Taiwan's Armed Forces possess recognized qualities of effectiveness; nevertheless, certain weaknesses exist. U.S. officers who have served as military advisors to Nationalist China, have spoken highly of the caliber of the troops. In addition, the average age of the soldiers is in the early twenties due to the influx of young Taiwanese. On the negative side, however, the Armed Forces continue to possess some obsolete equipment. For example, of the 13 combat squadrons in the Air Force, six are composed of Korean war vintages F-86 Sabrejets. The Army also operates with M-24 tanks of the same period. The Nationalists, with U.S. assistance, have begun a program of modernization, but this has not been completed. Until this modernization is completed, a weakness exists which should be corrected without delay.

Nationalist China's military capabilities are also limited by the fact that the United States has designed its military aid program to limit the Armed Forces role to one of defense. Taiwan currently has enough amphibious transport equipment to carry only one division across the Formosa Straits, and its air transport facilities can move no more than one parachute regiment at a given time. Because of this, only two divisions have received training in amphibious warfare. This situation also should be improved. Taiwan as an ally is very valuable and Taiwan's defenses should be among the best.

Despite the weaknesses which exist, it is obvious that Communist China does consider the Taiwan threat in mapping its military plans. Peking's current relations with her neighbors has forced it to station large numbers of troops at various points in the country; in Tibet, opposite India, along the Soviet frontier, and along the long coastline facing Taiwan. This situation has developed at a time when the absence of Soviet military aid has resulted in reported shortages of fuel and spare parts and a growing obsolescence of existing equipment.

These factors have a direct bearing on China's role in southeast Asia. Peking currently maintains a stationary force variously estimated at between 400,000 and 750,000 men opposite Taiwan to guard against an attack from that quarter. Pentagon analysts reportedly have asserted that this plus the Chinese Communists' other military commitments and equipment problems have made it impossible for them to commit more than 20 divisions—400,000 men—if they should decide to invade southeast Asia. Furthermore, should the leaders in Peking be thinking of embarking on such a course, they must consider the possibility of a counterattack from Taiwan, possibly in South China. Thus, given all of these factors, there can be little doubt that Taiwan today acts as a restraining influence on Peking in relation to the current struggle in southeast Asia.

The fact that Taiwan stands guard gives significant additional strength to the democracies in southeast Asia. We should provide the modern weapons which are needed to make Taiwan stand taller still in the affairs of the Pacific.

THE 1967 AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT RECOMMENDED BY THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act which have been recommended by the President.

As one who strongly supports the need for Federal emphasis and assistance in a program to bring the poor within reach of economic opportunity, I applaud the President's concentration on fundamentals.

And as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I know I speak for the entire committee in assuring the President that his recommendations will receive the careful and constructive consideration that they deserve.

This emphasis on fundamentals anticipates further important advances in the struggle to permit the poor to become self sufficient.

No radical, new approach is being sprung on the Congress in this bill. It is built on the experience the program has had in its 2-plus years of operation. Significant congressional suggestions are incorporated and provisions are included to prevent repeating mistakes that have been made.

The bill represents an endorsement of the program Congress has approved and which the Office of Economic Opportunity has carried out under the capable direction of Sargent Shriver since its enactment in 1964.

But the bill spells out in clearer detail the worthy purposes of this program; it deals in straightforward language with the problems that have developed.

To make these important changes the Economic Opportunity Act has been rewritten almost throughout, but the sound basic and principles behind the program are the same.

There are no handouts in this bill, no makework, no compulsion, and no dominant Federal power.

Community action is still stressed with great encouragement and emphasis placed on local decisionmaking and the utilization of every available resource—human and otherwise—to help the poor help themselves.

Education, training, work experience, job counseling, and health and legal services are stressed as ways of breaking down the obstacles which now bar those in poverty from taking advantage of the economic opportunity available to others in our affluent society.

The purpose throughout is to move those in poverty off the welfare and public assistance rolls into worthwhile employment and thus relieve both their own burden of human misery and the burden of others whose taxes have had to pay for their support.

There are undoubtedly differences of opinion as to how this purpose should be achieved, but I am convinced that the goal itself—the eradication of costly and

debilitating poverty—is an achievement sought by every Member of this House.

I ask, therefore, that the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act be considered in this light—maturely and with the wisdom and dedication this serious problem demands.

The bill which I have introduced proposes three titles. Title I, in effect, embodies the Economic Opportunity Act and the amendments that have been recommended.

Title I would authorize the appropriation of \$2.06 billion for programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity in fiscal year 1968. This would include \$1.022 billion for community action efforts, \$874 million for the Job Corps and work-training programs, \$47 million for rural loans and for programs for migrant and other seasonal farm laborers, \$70 million for work experience programs, and \$31 million for volunteers in service to America—VISTA.

Some in this body will say the request is too large but I would remind them that the problem is even larger. Some will say the request is too small. I would refer them to the President's description of his 1968 budget as one "for troubled times."

Throughout the bill you will find better statements of purpose, provisions for tighter administrative and fiscal control, stricter program evaluation requirements, greater emphasis on the need to combat rural poverty, new coordination of employment programs, an expansion of the role of States in the antipoverty effort and stronger encouragement for the participation in the program of the private sector—business, labor, and volunteer groups.

The objectives of community action are put in better focus by the bill and the structure of community action agencies is more clearly defined. Provision is made for the participation of public officials. Minimum functions are stated and the audit requirements imposed by the Congress last year are retained and strengthened.

Sections relating to the Job Corps provide for better screening of candidates and better placement of enrollees—both as to the centers they attend and in jobs upon their graduation. Techniques for improving discipline are included. In addition, the bill calls for an increase from 23 to 25 percent in the number of young women in the Job Corps and a reduction from \$7,500 to \$7,300 in the limit on the average annual cost per enrollee.

The bill proposes an Assistant Director for Rural Poverty, an Assistant Director and staff for the Economic Opportunity Council and new language relating to salary comparability features and to the incentives provided persons on public assistance to increase their outside earnings in productive employment.

Title II of the bill would establish a summer camp program as suggested by the President in his message to Congress on children and youth. Title III would provide certain criminal sanctions in cases of embezzlement, willful misapplication, theft or kickbacks involving

funds allocated under the Economic Opportunity Act.

The bill is broad, certainly, but the task before us is tremendous and the opportunity even greater. We have the chance, through a program against poverty, to serve the Nation in so many ways.

We can serve the poor by giving them the chance to work and to develop the dignity that comes to a man who can pay his own way. We can serve their children by giving them a better chance to break the poverty cycle that has gripped the family.

But more important we can serve the country by making it possible for all men to participate productively in an economic system that, in and of itself, will work against poverty and thus relieve the burden this problem now creates for the Nation.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED EDUCATION FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the bill would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program of institutional grants and graduate fellowships designed to attract young men and women to public service in any branch of State, local, or Federal Government, and to improve education for such service. The bill would authorize \$10,000,000 to be appropriated for the first fiscal year, and such sums as might be necessary for the next 4 fiscal years.

Title I of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education—and other designated public or private agencies in special circumstances—to assist them in preparing graduate or professional students to enter the public service, or for research into, or development or demonstration of, improved methods of educating students—including students at the undergraduate level—for the public service.

Grants or contracts would be equitably distributed throughout the United States among institutions that will be able to use the funds effectively, except that preference could be given to programs designed to meet an urgent national need.

Title II of the bill would authorize the Secretary to award fellowships, not to exceed 3 academic years in duration, for graduate or professional study for persons who plan to pursue a career in public service. Fellowships would be equitably distributed throughout the United States among institutions of higher education that have, or are developing, programs of high quality intended to educate persons for the public service or which contribute to the meeting of a significant and continuing need in the public service, except that preference could be given to programs designed to meet an urgent national need. The fellowships would carry a stipend consistent with prevailing practices under com-

parable federally supported programs, and a payment to the institution of \$2,500 per academic year.

The Secretary would be authorized to establish an advisory committee to advise him on matters of general policy arising in the administration of the act.

OVERSIGHT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the NASA Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit while the House is in session this afternoon and throughout the remainder of the week.

Mr. Speaker, we are undertaking a very important investigation through the efforts of this important subcommittee.

The SPEAKER. Will the distinguished gentleman from California please take the microphone and repeat his request?

Mr. MILLER of California. I shall be happy to do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the NASA Oversight Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics be permitted to sit this afternoon while the House is in session and be permitted to sit during the succeeding days of the week while the House is in session due to the fact that it is undertaking the Apollo investigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics indicate as to whether or not this request has been cleared by the ranking minority member?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I, as chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, have not had an opportunity to consult with the ranking minority member or with the other minority members on the committee. However, the full Committee on Science and Astronautics is sitting at this time and it is my opinion that the ranking minority member would agree to this request.

Mr. Speaker, we have a large number of witnesses and other participants now present before the full committee and we are anxious to get the investigation of this matter underway.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the request of the gentleman from California bears upon the investigation of the Apollo tragedy?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield further, it does deal with the Apollo tragedy.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, in the colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], I am credited with saying and using the words "best explanation," when that expression should have been "the worst indictment."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Record be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

BURNING THE AMERICAN FLAG

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to remind us of a happening in Paris last Friday which left me first dismayed and then angered. I refer to the burning of our flag. This kind of insult should raise our resentment to the boiling point.

Maybe some of the demonstrators were Communists. The press account simply said they were "youthful demonstrators." The fact remains they burned the flag of the United States, the symbol of our country.

Mr. Speaker, they burned it at the moment a program was commemorating our entry into World War I to help the French people in 1917, 50 years ago this April. Remember, it was this same flag that went in front of our troops when they went ashore in 1917. It is the flag of a country that has forgiven France an enormous money debt owed for World War I.

The French should remember that this flag, ripped from the American cathedral on Avenue George V, is the flag of Americans who have twice in this century come to help save the French nation.

Our State Department should enter an immediate and vigorous protest. We have a right to expect the French authorities to deal firmly with these offenders who are their own citizens. We in this country have laws to punish our own people who destroy the flag of another that is being properly displayed in the United States.

If General de Gaulle does not like our country or our stand in Vietnam, that is a policy matter. But to desecrate and then burn our flag is an act of such great disrespect as to be an assault against the very being of the United States.

The French should take quick and stern action against these demonstrators to provide evidence of assurance there remains some measure of gratitude in the hearts of the French people for the country that has more than once saved their national existence.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

SITES FOR CHANCERIES

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 6638) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to acquire certain real property in the District of Columbia determined to be necessary for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States or as sites for offices of other international organizations or governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee on the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commissioners") are authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise, such real property (and any buildings and other improvements thereon) which are within the two areas in the northwest section of the District of Columbia described in subsection (b), and which the Secretary of State determines to be necessary for sites for—

(1) a headquarters building for the Organization of American States,

(2) office buildings for other international organizations, or

(3) office buildings for foreign governments.

(b) Of the two areas referred to in subsection (a), one area comprises lots 11, 12, 13, 14, 56, 57, 809, 822, 829, 830, and 832 in square 2567; and the other area comprises lot 810 in square 2547. The lots and squares referred to in this subsection are those shown on plats of surveys recorded in the Office of the Surveyor of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners are authorized to sell, lease, or exchange real property acquired under section 1 of this Act to foreign governments and international organizations, including the Organization of American States, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of State, after consultation with the Commissioners, shall prescribe. Every lease, contract of sale, deed, and other document of transfer of real property, acquired by the Commissioners under section 1 of this Act, which is entered into by the Commissioners and a foreign government or an international organization shall provide—

(1) in the case of a foreign government, that such government shall use such real property to establish business offices for the chief of the diplomatic mission of such governments, and

(2) in the case of an international organization, that the international organization shall devote such real property to the organization's official uses.

SEC. 3. (a) The provisions of the Act of June 20, 1938 (D.C. Code, secs. 5-413-5-428), shall not apply to any building constructed by an international organization, including the Organization of American States, or a foreign government on real property acquired or leased under this Act by such organization or government. No building may be constructed by such organization or government on such real property until—

(1) plans showing (A) the building's location, height, bulk, number of stories, and size, and (B) the provisions for open-space and off-street parking in and around such

building, have been approved by the National Capital Planning Commission; and

(2) plans showing the building's height and the appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction of such building have been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

(b) The Commissioners shall provide to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations, displaced by acquisitions of real property by the Commissioners under section 1 of this Act, the relocation services and payments authorized by the Act of October 6, 1964 (D.C. Code, secs. 5-728-5-732). Individuals and families displaced by such acquisitions of real property shall be entitled to the same preference as is provided families in section 8(b) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code, sec. 5-707(b)).

(c) All costs incurred by the Commissioners in carrying out the purposes of this Act, including the cost of acquiring real property under section 1 of this Act and providing relocation services and payments, shall be borne by the United States.

(d) The costs of rerouting, relocating, and rebuilding public sewers and their appurtenances and water mains, fire hydrants, and other parts of the public water supply and distribution system which are occasioned in carrying out the purposes of this Act shall be without cost to the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 1, strike "are" and insert in lieu thereof "is".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I do so, Mr. Speaker, in order to ask if the gentleman would take some time and give us an explanation of this bill.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to explain the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 6638 is to provide that the government of the District of Columbia may acquire about 10 acres of vacant, unused land to be used for additional sites for the location of chanceries of foreign nations, or for the Organization of American States or other international organizations. As may be determined by the Secretary of State, the land acquired may be disposed of by the government of the District of Columbia at value by lease, sale, or exchange.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Committee hearings were held on February 15 and 16, 1967, at which testimony was presented by the Chief of Protocol of the Department of State, the Office of the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia, citizens organizations, businesses, and private citizens.

The Department of State presented information as to the needs for space for chanceries and other international organizations but expressed preference for its own proposal for the establishment of an enclave near Washington Circle which would involve acquisition of about 50 acres of land, 33 acres of which are privately owned and used for residential and business purposes.

On behalf of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Office of the Corporation Counsel expressed con-

cern that the provisions of the bill might result in costs to the local government. The clean bill, reported by your Committee, requires the Federal Government to bear all costs incurred under its terms.

Citizens associations, businesses, and other citizens supported the bill as preferable to the alternate proposal of the State Department, since it required no dislocations for residents and businesses and preserved tax revenues and jobs for the District of Columbia.

BACKGROUND

Until late 1957, a foreign government could purchase property in any residential area of the District of Columbia and convert it to chancery uses. Pursuant to the act of June 20, 1938—52 Stat. 797—new zoning regulations were developed and became effective in 1958. Since a chancery is essentially a business office of a foreign nation, the new regulations classified such uses as business uses and prohibited the location of chanceries in residential areas unless a special exception was approved by the Board of Zoning Adjustment for the District of Columbia.

The application of the 1958 zoning regulations relating to chanceries proved to be difficult and unsatisfactory to some foreign nations and to the residential areas of the District of Columbia. Many new small nations needing chancery facilities, and other nations desiring new and larger chanceries or extensions to existing facilities, filed applications for special exceptions. If an application for a special exception was denied, or if the citizens of the residential neighborhood militantly objected to such a business operation, such action could be misinterpreted and become a source of embarrassment to the Government of the United States. The lack of a clear law setting up criteria for the location of such chanceries made it extremely difficult to explain to the applicant nations the basis for a particular decision which rejected in one case and approved in another case, an application for a special exception.

THE 1964 CHANCERY ACT

During the 88th Congress, Public Law 88-659—78 Stat. 1091, approved October 13, 1964—was enacted "to regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia." Your committee at that time held detailed public hearings and received the views and suggestions of the Department of State, the Government of the District of Columbia, citizens' organizations, and private parties. The language developed was the result of numerous subcommittee meetings, conferences with officials of the State Department, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Zoning Board and others, to determine the actual needs to be met and find a reasonable basis for reconciling the interests of the citizens of the District of Columbia and at the same time making reasonable provision for the location of chanceries.

During the period of 1 year devoted to this legislation by your committee, many alternatives were considered and many drafts of legislation were produced. One of the alternatives suggested to State Department representatives was the es-

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 1545

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 14, 1967

Mr. CLARK introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

A BILL

To provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity
4 Amendments of 1967".

5 AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

6 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under
7 the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C
8 of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be ap-
9 propriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum

1 of \$2,060,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions of
2 section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made
3 available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$874,000,000
4 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I of
5 such Act, \$1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out
6 title II, \$47,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title III,
7 \$70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, \$16,-
8 000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and
9 \$31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII.

10 TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC
11 OPPORTUNITY ACT

12 JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS

13 SEC. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Oppor-
14 tunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

15 "PART A—JOB CORPS

16 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

17 "SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-
18 income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth
19 standards and procedures for selecting individuals as en-
20 rollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of
21 residential centers in which enrollees will participate in
22 intensive programs of education, vocational training, work
23 experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes
24 various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to
25 the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps.

1 Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can
2 benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in
3 a group setting distinct from their current environment,
4 to become more responsible, employable, and productive
5 citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where
6 feasible, to the development of National, State, and com-
7 munity resources, and to the development and dissemination
8 of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can
9 be widely utilized by public and private institutions and
10 agencies.

11 "ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

12 "SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office
13 of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

14 "INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

15 "SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a
16 young man or woman must be a person who—

17 "(1) is a permanent resident of the United States
18 who has attained age sixteen but not attained age twenty-
19 two at the time of enrollment;

20 "(2) is a low-income individual or member of a
21 low-income family who requires additional education,
22 training, or intensive counseling and related assistance
23 in order to secure and hold meaningful employment,
24 participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify

1 for other training programs suitable to his needs or satisfy
2 Armed Forces requirements;

3 “(3) is currently living in an environment so char-
4 acterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife
5 or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair
6 his prospects for successful participation in any other
7 program providing needed training, education, or assist-
8 ance;

9 “(4) is determined, after careful screening as pro-
10 vided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present
11 capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure
12 the full benefit of the program authorized in this part,
13 and to be free of medical and behaviorial problems so
14 serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust
15 to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern
16 of work and training which that program involves;

17 “(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as
18 the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with
19 all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

20 “SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL
21 PROVISIONS

22 “SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary
23 rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enroll-
24 ment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these
25 rules shall be implemented through arrangements which

1 make use of public or private nonprofit agencies and orga-
2 nizations such as community action agencies, public employ-
3 ment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations.
4 The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for
5 conducting screening and selection activities; shall encourage
6 recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact
7 with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accord-
8 ingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and
9 problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with
10 other individuals and organizations, including courts, proba-
11 tion and parole offices, law enforcement authorities, schools,
12 welfare agencies, and medical agencies, and advisers. They
13 shall also provide for—

14 “(1) an interview with each applicant for the pur-
15 pose of—

16 “(A) determining whether his educational and
17 vocational needs can best be met through the Job
18 Corps or any alternative program in his home
19 community;

20 “(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent
21 data relating to his background, needs, and interests
22 for evaluation in determining his eligibility and po-
23 tential assignment; and

24 “(C) giving the applicant a full understand-
25 ing of the Job Corps program and making clear

1 what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the
2 event of his acceptance.

3 “(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic in-
4 quiry concerning the applicant’s background for the
5 effective development and, as appropriate, clarification
6 of information concerning his age, citizenship, school
7 and draft status, health, employability, past behavior,
8 family income, environment, and other matters related
9 to a determination of his eligibility.

10 “(b) The Director shall make no payments to any in-
11 dividual or organization solely as compensation for the serv-
12 ice of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the
13 Job Corps.

14 “SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

15 “SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an
16 enrollee unless it is determined that he can participate suc-
17 cessfully in group situations and activities with other en-
18 rollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior
19 that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit
20 of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of
21 sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any
22 center to which he might be assigned and surrounding com-
23 munities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both
24 the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences
25 of failure to observe those rules. An individual shall be con-

1 sidered not to meet these requirements if he has a history of
2 serious and violent behavior against persons or property,
3 repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction or other major
4 behavioral aberrations. The rules or regulations issued by
5 the Director under this section shall specify, in detail, the
6 actions or attributes which shall preclude selection, and those
7 rules or regulations shall be binding upon all agencies au-
8 thorized to screen or select persons for enrollment. The
9 Director may authorize screening and selection agencies to
10 refer to him cases where, notwithstanding the fact that the
11 individual is not subject to specific disqualification set forth
12 in those rules or regulations, they believe that there may be
13 doubt as to whether he should be accepted; and cases where,
14 notwithstanding a specific disqualification, they believe there
15 may be unusual circumstances warranting an exception to
16 permit selection. Exceptions, however, shall be granted by
17 the Director only where he determines that selection would
18 be fully consistent with the standards relating to the interests
19 of other enrollees, the maintenance of discipline and satis-
20 factory community relations, as set forth in this section.

21 “(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enroll-
22 ment may be selected even though he is on probation or
23 parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision
24 of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually
25 satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not

1 violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director
2 has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and
3 all reports to State or other authorities that may be neces-
4 sary to comply with applicable probation or parole require-
5 ments.

6 “(c) The Director shall maintain a continuing review
7 of the criteria and procedures established under this part
8 for the screening and selection of Job Corps applicants both
9 with respect to their adequacy and the effectiveness with
10 which they are applied, and he shall take such actions as
11 may be necessary to assure that all agencies which are
12 assigned screening and selection functions comply fully with
13 those criteria and procedures.

14 “ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

15 “SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the
16 Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director
17 may authorize in special cases.

18 “(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve
19 any individual of obligations under the Universal Military
20 Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

21 “(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of
22 Cuba described in section 609 (3) of this Act) must take
23 and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form:
24 ‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and
25 allegiance to the United States of America and will support

1 and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States
2 against all its enemies foreign and domestic.' The provi-
3 sions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall
4 be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

5 “(d) Each enrollee shall be assigned to a center appro-
6 priate to his needs, as determined by the Director, which
7 (taking into account current vacancies and requirements for
8 the efficient program operation) is closest to the residence of
9 such enrollee.

10 “(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so
11 that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those en-
12 rollees are assigned to conservation centers, as described in
13 section 107, or to other centers or projects where their work
14 activity is primarily directed to the conservation, develop-
15 ment, or management of public national resources or recrea-
16 tional areas and is performed under the direction of personnel
17 of agencies regularly responsible for those functions.

18 “JOB CORPS CENTERS

19 “SEC. 107. The Director may make agreements with
20 Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for
21 the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These
22 centers shall be primarily residential in character and shall
23 be designated and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a
24 well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training,
25 work experience (either in direct program activities or

1 through arrangements with employers) , counseling and other
2 services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall in-
3 clude conservation centers to be located primarily in rural
4 areas and to provide, in addition to other training and as-
5 sistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities
6 to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or
7 public recreational areas or to assist in developing community
8 projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's
9 training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas
10 and to provide activities which shall include training and
11 other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected
12 to participate successfully in training for specific types of
13 skilled or semiskilled employment; and women's training cen-
14 ters, to be located in either urban or rural areas, and which
15 shall provide education, training, and other activities appro-
16 priate to the special needs and potentialities of young women.

17 "PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

18 "SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be oper-
19 ated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-orga-
20 nized and fully supervised program of education, vocational
21 training, work experience, planned avocational and recrea-
22 tional activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and
23 counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required pro-
24 gram for each enrollee shall include activities designed to
25 assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with

1 problems he may encounter in his home community or in
2 adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing
3 his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-
4 term upward mobility, and shall aggregate at least sixty hours
5 a week. Center programs shall include required participa-
6 tion in center maintenance support and related work activity
7 as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of
8 contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

9 “(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may ar-
10 range for enrollee education and vocational training through
11 local public or private educational agencies, vocational educa-
12 tional institutions, or technical institutes where these institu-
13 tions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and
14 substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could
15 provide through other means.

16 “(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent
17 feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain
18 the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;
19 and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of
20 Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to
21 be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their
22 services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee's
23 level of educational attainment.

24 “(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure
25 that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do

1 not displace presently employed workers or impair existing
2 contracts for service and will be coordinated with other
3 work-experience programs in the community.

4 "ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

5 "SEC. 109. (a) The Director may provide enrollees
6 with such personal travel and leave allowances, and such
7 quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing,
8 recreational services, and other expenses as he may deem
9 necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances
10 shall be established at a rate not to exceed \$50 per month,
11 except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Direc-
12 tor; shall be graduated up to the maximum so as to encour-
13 age achievement and the best use by the enrollee of the funds
14 so provided; and shall be subject to reduction in appropriate
15 cases as a disciplinary measure. To the degree reasonable,
16 enrollees shall be required to meet or contribute to costs
17 associated with their individual comfort and enjoyment from
18 their personal allowances.

19 "(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules govern-
20 ing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of
21 emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs
22 connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed
23 at least six months service in the Job Corps.

24 "(c) The Director may provide each former enrollee,

1 upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to
2 exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the
3 Job Corps. No enrollee shall be entitled to a readjustment
4 allowance, however, unless he has remained in the program
5 at least ninety days, except in unusual circumstances as deter-
6 mined by the Director. The Director may, from time to
7 time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions
8 of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems neces-
9 sary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by
10 that enrollee; and he may also, pursuant to rules or regula-
11 tions, reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allow-
12 ance as a penalty for misconduct during participation in the
13 Job Corps. In the event of an enrollee's death during his
14 period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment
15 allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions
16 of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

17 “(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may
18 determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an
19 enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory
20 service may be paid during the period of service of the en-
21 rollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any
22 other relative who draws substantial support from the en-
23 rollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the
24 payment of an equal amount by the Director.

“STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

1
2 “SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of
3 conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently
4 enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees,
5 dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations
6 shall be made in every instance where it is determined that
7 retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center,
8 will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct
9 and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other
10 enrollees.

11 “(b) In order to promote the proper moral and dis-
12 ciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual direc-
13 tors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to
14 take appropriated disciplinary measures against enrollees in-
15 cluding, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps,
16 subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority,
17 as provided under regulations set by the Director.

18 “COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

19 “SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall
20 cooperate in activities designed to establish a mutually
21 beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers and sur-
22 rounding or nearby communities. These activities shall in-
23 clude the establishment of community advisory councils to
24 provide a mechanism for joint discussion of common prob-

1 lems and for planning programs of mutual interest. Youth
2 participation in advisory council affairs shall be encouraged
3 and where feasible separate youth councils may be estab-
4 lished, to be composed of representative enrollees and rep-
5 resentative young people from the communities. The
6 Director shall establish necessary rules and take necessary
7 action to assure that each center is operated in a manner
8 consistent with this section with a view to achieving, so far
9 as possible, objectives which shall include: (1) giving
10 community officials appropriate advance notice of changes
11 in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect or
12 be of interest to the community; (2) affording the com-
13 munity a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern
14 to it, including policies governing the issuance and terms of
15 passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full
16 and rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies,
17 including law enforcement agencies and agencies which work
18 with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the
19 fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or
20 projects for community improvement or betterment, with
21 adequate advance consultation with business, labor, profes-
22 sional, and other interested community groups and organiza-
23 tions; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events
24 in which enrollees and local residents may participate to-

1 gether; (6) providing community residents with oppor-
2 tunities to work with enrollees directly, as part-time instruc-
3 tors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center or in the
4 community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career
5 opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8)
6 promoting interchanges of information and techniques among,
7 and cooperative projects involving, the center and community
8 schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young
9 people.

10 “PLACEMENT AND FOLLOWTHROUGH

11 “SEC. 112. The Director shall provide or arrange for
12 necessary services to assist enrollees to secure suitable em-
13 ployment or further training opportunities, to return to school
14 or pursue their education, or undertake some other activity
15 having a career potential. To the extent feasible, placement
16 services shall be undertaken through or in cooperation with
17 agencies or organizations, including the public employment
18 service, which will be in a position to provide enrollees with
19 reasonable followthrough necessary or appropriate to aid
20 them in making a satisfactory initial adjustment with par-
21 ticular attention to those enrollees who in the course of com-
22 pleting their enrollment in a satisfactory manner have
23 demonstrated the motivation to overcome special handicaps,
24 or who face unusual adjustment problems, as in a new com-
25 munity.

1 “EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL

2 PROJECTS

3 “SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the care-
4 ful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program,
5 with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as prac-
6 ticable, and providing information needed to assess the
7 effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods
8 of operation. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director
9 shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to
10 compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques
11 with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to
12 secure, through employers, schools, or other Government
13 and private agencies specific information concerning the
14 residence of former enrollees, their employment status, com-
15 pensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He
16 shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information
17 directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following
18 their completion of the Job Corps program.

19 “(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or
20 contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration proj-
21 ects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the
22 better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjust-
23 ment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduc-
24 tion in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transporta-

tion and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. Projects under this subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, including programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility and usefulness. He shall, either in his annual report or a separate annual document, report to the Congress concerning the actions taken under this section, including a full description of progress made in connection with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

“ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

“SEC. 114. The Director shall make use of advisory committees or boards in connection with the operation of the

1 Job Corps, and the operation of Job Corps centers, when-
2 ever he determines that the availability of outside advice and
3 counsel on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in
4 identifying and overcoming problems, in planning program
5 or center development, or in strengthening relationships be-
6 tween the Job Corps and agencies, institutions, or groups
7 engaged in related activities. Nothing in this section shall
8 be considered as limiting the functions of the National Ad-
9 visory Council, established pursuant to section 605 of this
10 Act, with respect to any matter or question involving the
11 Job Corps; but this shall not prevent the establishment
12 through or in cooperation with the National Advisory Coun-
13 cil of one or more boards or committees under this section.

14 "PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

15 "SEC. 115. (a) The Director shall take necessary action
16 to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job
17 Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation
18 with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to
19 the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of en-
20 rollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaning-
21 ful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and
22 coordination with State-operated programs.

23 "(b) The Director may enter into agreements with
24 States to assist in the operation or administration of State-
25 operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part.

1 The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of
2 the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

3 “(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility
4 designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be estab-
5 lished within a State unless a plan setting forth such pro-
6 posed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and
7 such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days
8 of such submission.

9 “APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

10 “SEC. 116. (a) Except as otherwise specifically pro-
11 vided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees
12 in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees
13 and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to
14 Federal employment, including those regarding hours of
15 work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compen-
16 sation, and Federal employee benefits:

17 “(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of
18 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security
19 Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed em-
20 ployees of the United States and any service performed by an
21 individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in
22 the employ of the United States.

23 “(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of
24 title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation
25 to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be

1 deemed civil employees of the United States within the
2 meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 8101 of
3 title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that sub-
4 chapter shall apply except as follows:

5 “(A) The term ‘performance of duty’ shall not in-
6 clude any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her
7 assigned post of duty, except while participating in an
8 activity (including an activity while on pass or during
9 travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or
10 under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

11 “(B) In computing compensation benefits for dis-
12 ability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be
13 deemed that received under the entrance salary for a
14 grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of
15 title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

16 “(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to
17 accrue until the day following the date on which the
18 injured enrollee is terminated.

19 “(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions
20 in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered
21 employees of the Government.

22 “(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to
23 persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job
24 Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and
25 it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United

1 States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not
2 exceeding \$500.

3 “(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are de-
4 tailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements
5 made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not
6 be counted in computing strength under any law limiting
7 the strength of such services or in computing the percentage
8 authorized by law for any grade therein.

9 “SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

10 “SEC. 117. (a) The Director shall not use any funds
11 made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year
12 ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase above
13 forty-five thousand the enrollee capacity of Job Corps centers.

14 “(b) The Director shall take necessary action to insure
15 that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of
16 Job Corps enrollees in residence and receiving training, at
17 least 25 per centum shall be women.

18 “(c) The Director shall take necessary action to insure
19 that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job
20 Corps centers which have been in operation for more than
21 nine months do not exceed \$7,300 per enrollee.

22 “(d) The Director shall take necessary action to insure
23 that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced
24 or developed with Federal funds in the course of the opera-

1 tion of any conservation or training center shall become the
2 property of the United States.

3 “POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

4 “SEC. 118. (a) No officer or employee of the executive
5 branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry
6 concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee
7 or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures
8 concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such
9 membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes
10 by law a disqualification for Government employment. No
11 discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by
12 any person in the executive branch of the Federal Govern-
13 ment against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or
14 any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his
15 political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically
16 authorized or required by law.

17 “(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall
18 take any active part in political management or in political
19 campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to
20 statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use
21 his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering
22 with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such
23 persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and
24 to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all

1 political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee,
2 enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political
3 purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation
4 of the Corrupt Practices Act.

5 “(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Com-
6 mission finds that any person has violated the foregoing pro-
7 visions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for
8 explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned,
9 certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as
10 to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.”

11 WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

12 SEC. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic
13 Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part B
14 of such title and amended to read as follows:

15 “PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

16 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

17 “SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful
18 work-experience and work-training opportunities, together
19 with related services and assistance, that will assist low-
20 income youths to continue or resume their education, and to
21 help unemployed, underemployed, or other low-income and
22 severely disadvantaged persons, both young and adult, to
23 obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with max-
24 imum opportunities for local initiative in developing pro-
25 grams which respond to local needs and problems, including

1 programs using both public and private resources to overcome
2 the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in
3 areas having high concentrations of unemployment, under-
4 employment, and low income.

5 "NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

6 "SEC. 121. The Director may provide financial assist-
7 ance for—

8 "(1) programs to provide part-time employment,
9 on-the-job training, and useful work experience for stu-
10 dents from low-income families who are in the ninth
11 through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equiv-
12 alent to that of students in such grades) and who are
13 in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or
14 maintain attendance in school; and

15 "(2) programs to provide unemployed individuals
16 (aged sixteen through twenty-one years at the time of
17 enrollment) with useful work experience and on-the-job
18 training, combined where needed with educational and
19 training assistance, including basic literacy and occupa-
20 tional training, designed to assist those individuals to de-
21 velop their maximum occupational potential.

22 "COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

23 "SEC. 122. (a) The Director may provide financial
24 assistance for community employment and training projects.
25 These projects shall provide work experience, on-the-job, or

1 work training for unemployed, underemployed, or low-
2 income persons (including projects involving both adults and
3 youths age sixteen or over). They shall be designed to
4 assist participants to secure or qualifying for—

5 “(1) permanent, meaningful employment without
6 further assistance under this section, and

7 “(2) wherever possible, entry-level jobs involving
8 the use or acquisition of skills needed for subprofessional
9 or other career opportunities offering promise of regular
10 or continued advancement.

11 “(b) Where feasible and consistent with the objectives
12 of subsection (a), projects under this section shall be de-
13 signed so that participants acquire work skills or experience
14 in activities that involve, or will lead to permanent employ-
15 ment in, fields where there are critical or unmet community
16 needs. These fields may include, without limitation, the
17 management, conservation, or development of natural re-
18 sources, recreational areas, public parks, highways, or other
19 lands; neighborhood redevelopment; the provision of health,
20 education, welfare, or public safety services; or other activi-
21 ties directed to bettering or beautifying a community or area
22 or improving its physical, social, economic, or cultural
23 condition.

24 “(c) Projects under this section shall include related
25 supportive services, including basic education, occupational

1 training, health services, and special counseling, as needed to
2 assist participants to attain the objectives described in sub-
3 section (a).

4 “(d) In determining whether, in what amount and on
5 what conditions, to assist projects or parts of projects other-
6 wise eligible under this section, the Director shall consider—

7 “(1) in all cases, the degree to which efforts have
8 been made to provide assurances of regular employment
9 at the earliest feasible time, and the degree to which the
10 project has been developed and realistically structured
11 so as to take account of the desires, needs, and capabil-
12 ities of participants;

13 “(2) in the case of projects or parts of projects in-
14 volving activities related to physical improvements,
15 whether the improvements will be substantially used by
16 the low-income persons and families or will contribute
17 substantially to amenities or facilities in areas or neigh-
18 borhoods having concentrations of low-income persons
19 and families;

20 “(3) in the case of projects or parts of projects in-
21 volving the development of entry-level employment
22 opportunities, the extent to which the proposed activities
23 will not only benefit those directly participating but will
24 also contribute or give promise of contributing to the
25 broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs or

1 providing job ladder opportunities, the development and
2 recognition of new types of careers for low-income and
3 disadvantaged persons, or the elimination of artificial
4 barriers in the community to employment and advance-
5 ment on the part of those persons.

6 "SPECIAL URBAN EMPLOYMENT IMPACT PROGRAMS

7 "SEC. 123. (a) The Director may provide necessary
8 financial assistance, as provided in this section, to meet costs
9 of developing, planning, and carrying out projects which are
10 designed to assist in meeting some of the critical problems
11 facing urban areas, and to stimulate the fuller and more
12 effective use of the resources which are or can be made
13 available in those areas to permit a substantial increase in
14 employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

15 "(b) Projects under this section must—

16 "(1) be carried on in an urban area or neighbor-
17 hood (defined without regard to political or other
18 subdivision boundaries) having especially large concen-
19 trations of unemployed, underemployed, or low-income
20 individuals, or be primarily designed to serve the needs
21 of such individuals residing in such areas;

22 "(2) be supported by specific commitments of
23 cooperation on the part of public and private employers
24 in the community, including assurances that, to the

1 maximum extent feasible, permanent employment op-
2 portunities have been or will be developed that are
3 commensurate with the size, scope, schedule, and objec-
4 tives of the program.

5 “(3) provide for the maximum feasible use of re-
6 sources under other programs relating to the training
7 of individuals to improve or restore their employability,
8 including commitments of specific training opportunities
9 under the Manpower Development and Training Act
10 of 1962;

11 “(4) be appropriately focused to assure that work
12 and training opportunities are extended, so far as pos-
13 sible, to the most severely disadvantaged individuals who
14 can reasonably be expected, given the other services or
15 support available, to benefit from such training;

16 “(5) include or provide for expanded, more in-
17 tensive, or improved supportive services not generally
18 available, including day care for children, transportation,
19 job orientation, health services, and intensive and con-
20 tinuing counseling, both before and after job placement,
21 as necessary to assist participants to develop necessary
22 job attitudes and the capability to secure, hold, and ad-
23 vance in regular competitive employment;

24 “(6) comply with other requirements prescribed

1 by the Director to assure that programs are realistically
2 structured to take account of the desires, needs and
3 capabilities of participants; are directed so far as possible
4 to specific, measurable goals and subject to adequate pro-
5 visions for continuing local evaluation; are supported by
6 assurances of needed cooperation from all relevant State
7 or local governmental and private agencies; and will
8 otherwise be administered and carried on in an efficient
9 and effective manner.

10 “(c) In addition to necessary costs of developing or
11 planning projects, financial assistance under this section may
12 be used to meet—

13 “(1) costs of initiating or expanding projects or
14 activities which are eligible for financial assistance under
15 other sections of this part;

16 “(2) costs of expanding projects or activities under
17 other programs related to the training of individuals for
18 the purpose of improving or restoring employability;

19 “(3) costs of providing required supportive services
20 not otherwise available; and

21 “(4) such other costs of administering, coordinat-
22 ing, or evaluating projects, including the provision of
23 necessary related equipment or facilities, as may be
24 specifically authorized in regulations of the Director.

1 “COORDINATION

2 “SEC. 124. Programs under this part shall be carried
3 on with appropriate assistance from other Federal agencies
4 having related responsibilities and shall be coordinated with
5 other local and community programs, including maximum
6 coordination with community action programs. They shall
7 include necessary arrangements to best assure that individ-
8 uals are recruited, referred, and provided with training,
9 work experience, and other assistance in the manner that most
10 accurately reflects each person's capacity to benefit from
11 several programs authorized under this title and from other
12 programs available to him which provide services designed
13 to enhance or restore employability.

14 “PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS: APPLICATION OF FEDERAL
15 LAWS

16 “SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this
17 part must be individuals who are permanent residents of
18 the United States. For purposes of determining eligibility
19 for participation in programs under this part, any individual
20 shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family
21 receives cash welfare payments.

22 “(b) Participants shall not be deemed Federal em-
23 ployees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law
24 relating to Federal employment, including those relating to

1 hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment
2 compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

3 "GENERAL CONDITIONS FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

4 "SEC. 126. The Director shall not provide financial
5 assistance for any program under this part unless he deter-
6 mines, in accordance with such regulations as he may pre-
7 scribe, that—

8 "(1) no participant will be employed on projects
9 involving political parties, or the construction, opera-
10 tion, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is
11 used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place
12 for religious worship;

13 "(2) the program will not result in the displace-
14 ment of employed workers or impair existing contracts
15 for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for
16 other funds in connection with work that would other-
17 wise be performed;

18 "(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-
19 training and education, and other conditions of employ-
20 ment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light
21 of such factors as the type of work, geographical region,
22 and proficiency of the participant;

23 "(4) the program will, to the maximum extent
24 feasible, contribute to the occupational development or
25 upward mobility of individual participants.

1 “EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

2 “SEC. 127. (a) The Director shall establish criteria
3 designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance
4 under sections 121 and 122 among the States. In develop-
5 ing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant
6 factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family
7 income levels.

8 “(b) Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal
9 year for programs authorized under this title, the Director
10 shall reserve not to exceed 25 per centum for the purpose
11 of carrying out section 123; but not more than $12\frac{1}{2}$ per
12 centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be
13 used within any one State.

14 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

15 “SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly, through
16 contracts or other appropriate arrangements) such technical
17 assistance or training for personnel as he determines is neces-
18 sary to assist in the initiation or effective operation of pro-
19 grams under this part. He shall, in exercising this authority,
20 give special consideration to the problems of rural areas, with
21 a view to simplifying procedures and other technical require-
22 ments wherever feasible; developing model programs or
23 projects; assisting rural areas to secure or better use resources
24 under other programs relating to increasing or restoring

1 employability and to combine those with projects or pro-
2 grams under this part; and generally assisting agencies in
3 rural areas to develop and carry on the most effective pro-
4 grams consistent with local conditions.

5 "LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

6 "SEC. 129. (a) Federal financial assistance to any pro-
7 gram or activity carried out pursuant to sections 121, 122,
8 and 123 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the
9 cost of such program or activity, including costs of adminis-
10 tration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in
11 excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regu-
12 lations establishing objective criteria for such determinations,
13 that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this
14 part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind,
15 fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equip-
16 ment, and services.

17 "(b) In the case of on-the-job training projects with
18 other than public or private nonprofit organizations, the
19 Director may authorize or enter into agreements to pay
20 reasonable training costs, but not wages paid to participants
21 for services performed.

1 “(c) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure
2 that programs under this part are carried on subject to
3 adequate internal controls, accounting requirements, and rules
4 governing personnel standards and policies as may be neces-
5 sary or appropriate to promote efficiency and the effective
6 use of funds.

7 “(d) Financial assistance under this part shall be ex-
8 tended only to projects which are sponsored by public or
9 private nonprofit agencies. The Director may, however,
10 contract in special cases for the carrying out of projects or
11 parts of projects by other private organizations where he
12 finds such a contract to be justified on the basis of efficiency
13 and economy and otherwise consistent with the provisions
14 and purposes of this part.

15 “EVALUATION

16 “SEC. 130. The Director shall provide for the continuing
17 evaluation of the programs under this title, including their
18 effectiveness in achieving stated goals and their impact on
19 other related programs. He may, for this purpose, contract
20 for independent evaluations of those programs or individual
21 projects.”

1 COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

2 SEC. 103. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of
3 1964 is amended to read as follows:

4 “TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY
5 ACTION PROGRAMS

6 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

7 “SEC. 201. This title provides for community action
8 agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes
9 the functions of community action agencies, and author-
10 izes financial assistance to community action programs and
11 related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimu-
12 late a better focusing of all available local, State, private, and
13 Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income
14 families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and
15 urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations
16 and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully
17 self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote, as meth-
18 ods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of
19 individual and family self-sufficiency—

20 “(1) the strengthening of community capabilities
21 for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other
22 assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that
23 this assistance, through the efforts of local officials, orga-
24 nizations, and interested and affected citizens, can be
25 made more responsible to local needs and conditions;

1 “(2) the better organization of a range of services
2 related to the needs of the poor, so that these services
3 may be made more effective and efficient in helping
4 families and individuals to overcome particular problems
5 in a way that takes account of, and supports their prog-
6 ress in overcoming, related problems;

7 “(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evalua-
8 tion, of new types of services and innovative approaches
9 in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increas-
10 ingly effective methods of employing available resources;

11 “(4) the development and implementation of all
12 programs and projects designed to serve the poor or
13 low-income areas with the maximum feasible participa-
14 tion of residents of the areas and members of the groups
15 served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of
16 capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those
17 programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and
18 widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and

19 “(5) the broadening of the resource base of pro-
20 grams directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to
21 secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public
22 officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood
23 organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role
24 for business, labor, and professional groups able to pro-
25 vide employment opportunities or otherwise influence

1 the quantity and quality of services of concern to the
2 poor.

3 "PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND
4 PROGRAMS

5 "ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES;
6 COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

7 "SEC. 210. (a) The Director shall encourage commu-
8 nities to establish public or private nonprofit agencies, to be
9 known as community action agencies. A community action
10 agency shall be responsible for, and must be capable of,
11 planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a pro-
12 gram, to be known as a community action program. A
13 community action program is a community based and oper-
14 ated program—

15 " (1) which includes or is designed to include a suf-
16 ficient number of projects or components to provide, in
17 sum, a range of services and activities having a measur-
18 able and potentially major impact on causes of poverty
19 in the community or those areas of the community
20 where poverty is a particularly acute problem;

21 " (2) which has been developed, and which or-
22 ganizes and combines its component projects and activi-
23 ties, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the
24 purposes of this title; and

25 " (3) which conforms to such other supplementary

criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions of this title.

“(b) Components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency, where consistent with sound and efficient management and applicable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be either specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

“(c) The community in which a community action agency is established to carry on a community action program may be a city, county, multicity, multicounty, or other governmental unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (whether or not its boundaries correspond with those of any political subdivision) ; but it must in any event provide the organizational base and possess the commonality of interest needed for an efficient and effective program conforming to the requirements of this section.

“STRUCTURE OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

“SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency shall be established and constructed so as to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases

1 of the community action program for which it is responsible,
2 and to assure that the program as developed and implemented
3 is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each
4 such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board
5 organized to provide for membership of the chief elected
6 official or officials of the community and other appropriate
7 public officials, or their representatives, of officials or repre-
8 sentatives of private groups and agencies engaged in pro-
9 viding assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representa-
10 tives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and
11 interests in the community. At least one-third of the mem-
12 bership of the board shall be persons chosen in accordance
13 with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that
14 they are representative of the poor in the community. All
15 members of the governing board selected to represent specific
16 geographic areas within a community must reside in the areas
17 they represent. Each community action agency shall estab-
18 lish procedures by which community agencies and represent-
19 ative groups of the poor, including but not limited to mi-
20 nority groups, the elderly and (where applicable) rural
21 residents, which feel themselves inadequately represented
22 may petition for the representation they consider appropriate.

23 “(b) The powers of every community action agency
24 governing board shall include the power to appoint persons
25 to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal,

1 and program policies, to approve overall program plans and
2 priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and
3 approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.

4 "SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY

5 ACTION AGENCIES

6 "SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall respon-
7 sibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and adminis-
8 tering a community action program, a community action
9 agency must have authority under its charter or applicable
10 law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds
11 and contributions from private or local public sources which
12 may be used in support of a community action program, and
13 funds under any Federal or State assistance program pur-
14 suant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the
15 case may be) organized in accordance with this part could
16 act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate
17 for inclusion in a community action program. A community
18 action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so
19 received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject
20 to the powers of its governing board and its overall program
21 responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate
22 powers must include the power to make transfers and dele-
23 gations covering component projects in all cases where this
24 will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise
25 further program objectives.

1 “(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its over-
2 all responsibility for a community action program, a commu-
3 nity action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this
4 title, at least the following functions:

5 “(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating the
6 program, including actions to develop information as to
7 the problems and causes of poverty in the community,
8 determine how much and how effectively assistance is
9 being provided to deal with those problems and causes,
10 and establish priorities among projects, activities and
11 areas as needed for the best and most efficient use of
12 resources.

13 “(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities
14 related to the community action program to plan for,
15 secure and administer assistance available under this title
16 or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis;
17 providing planning or technical assistance to those agen-
18 cies; and generally, in cooperation with community
19 agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve
20 existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-
21 to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing
22 resources on the most needy, and providing additional
23 opportunities to low-income individuals for regular em-
24 ployment or participation in the programs or activities

1 for which those community agencies and officials are
2 responsible.

3 “(3) Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive
4 to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met,
5 with particular emphasis on providing central or com-
6 mon services that can be drawn upon by a variety of
7 related programs, developing new approaches or new
8 types of services that can be incorporated into other
9 programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or
10 modification of those programs.

11 “(4) Establishing effective procedures by which the
12 poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to
13 influence the character of programs affecting their in-
14 terests, providing for their regular participation in the
15 implementation of those programs, and providing tech-
16 nical and other support needed to enable the poor and
17 neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf
18 available assistance from public and private sources.

19 “(5) Joining with and encouraging business, labor,
20 and other private groups and organizations to undertake,
21 together with public officials and agencies, activities in
22 support of the community action program which will re-
23 sult in the additional use of private resources and capabil-
24 ities, with a view to such things as developing new

1 employment opportunities, stimulating investment that
2 will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty
3 among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and
4 providing methods by which residents of those areas
5 can work with private groups, firms, and institutions
6 in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.

7 "STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

8 "SEC. 213. A State or regional agency may be a
9 community action agency for the purpose of programs
10 in a number of rural areas or smaller communities if the
11 Director determines that the agency is structured and capable
12 of operating in a manner consistent with the purposes of
13 this part, including the participation and representation re-
14 quirements of section 211 (a), and that the operation of
15 a State or regional program in the areas or communities
16 concerned is justified on the basis of efficiency and effective-
17 ness.

18 "ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

19 "SEC. 214. (a) Each community action agency shall
20 observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage
21 other agencies participating in a community action program
22 to observe, standards of organization, management and
23 administration which will assure, so far as reasonably pos-
24 sible, that all program activities are conducted in a manner

1 consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective
2 of providing assistance effectively, efficiently and free of
3 any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family
4 favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish
5 or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include
6 rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed
7 by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community
8 action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access
9 to information, including but not limited to public hearings
10 at the request of appropriate community groups and reason-
11 able public access to books and records of the agency or
12 other agencies engaged in program activities or operations
13 involving the use of authority or funds for which it is
14 responsible. And each community action agency shall adopt
15 for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising author-
16 ity for which it is responsible rules designed to establish
17 specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel
18 and per diem allowances, and other employee benefits; to
19 assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties
20 with competence and integrity are employed and that em-
21 ployees are promoted or advanced under impartial proce-
22 dures calculated to improve agency performance and effective-
23 ness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of inter-
24 ests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf

1 of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any
2 case preclude employees from participating, in connection
3 with the performance of their duties, in any form of picket-
4 ing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation
5 of law.

6 “(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations
7 to supplement subsection (a), which shall include regula-
8 tions governing matters relating to partisan political activities
9 and elections referred to in section 603 (b) of this Act, and
10 which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on commu-
11 nity action program activities with financial assistance under
12 this title. He may, where appropriate, establish special or
13 simplified requirements for smaller agencies or agencies oper-
14 ating in rural areas. These special requirements shall not,
15 however, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts
16 of interest, use of position or authority for partisan political
17 purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of cus-
18 tomary practices or rules among agencies in the community.
19 The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal
20 agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to
21 activities which may be included in community action pro-
22 grams for the purpose of securing maximum consistency be-
23 tween rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those
24 agencies and those prescribed under this section.

1 “EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND
2 PROGRAMS

3 “SEC. 215. (a) In determining whether, in which
4 amount, and on what conditions, to extend financial assist-
5 ance to a new community action program, the Director shall
6 consider evidence of the extent of poverty in the community
7 and the probable capacity of the agency to undertake an
8 efficient and effective program in full conformity to the pur-
9 poses of this title. In renewing or supplementing that finan-
10 cial assistance, he shall consider the progress made in carry-
11 ing on such a program, consistent with needs and with due
12 allowance for the special problems of rural and smaller com-
13 munities, and the efficiency with which the agency has dis-
14 charged its specific functions and duties to this end. The
15 Director shall prescribe standards for evaluation of overall
16 effectiveness and specific agency operations in accordance
17 with this subsection. In developing those standards he shall
18 consider, but not be limited to, the use of criteria covering:
19 the number and incomes of persons or families served and
20 seeking to be served and the length of their participation; the
21 extent to which those persons and families have been aided in
22 establishing specific goals and have in fact attained those
23 goals; the extent to which resources have been committed
24 which are over and above the contributions required by this

1 title; the degree to which full use has been made of sources
 2 of financial assistance other than this title; the degree to
 3 which agencies, groups, and organizations, including the poor
 4 and area representatives, have actively participated in the
 5 formulation and implementation of the program in question;
 6 the extent and effectiveness of followthrough arrangements
 7 among agencies operating different components and related
 8 agencies in the community; and the extent to which activi-
 9 ties or approaches initiated as part of the program have been
 10 incorporated in other ongoing programs in the community.

11 “(b) In addition to evaluations undertaken directly by
 12 him or by community action agencies, the Director may pro-
 13 vide for, or require community action agencies to provide for,
 14 independent evaluations. Where appropriate, he may also
 15 require a community action agency to establish an inde-
 16 pendent group or committee to provide evaluation and ad-
 17 visory services on either a short-term or continuing basis.

18 “PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY
 19 ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

20 “DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

21 “SEC. 220. The Director may provide financial assist-
 22 ance to community action agencies to assist them in develop-
 23 ing community action programs in accordance with this title.
 24 He may also provide financial assistance to other public or
 25 private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the

1 establishment of a community action agency or participa-
2 tion in a community action program, including assistance to
3 local governments in connection with planning activities
4 and organizational changes to support or improve the effec-
5 tiveness of such programs.

6 “GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

7 TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

8 “SEC. 221. (a) In order to aid in the implementation of
9 community action programs, the Director may provide gen-
10 eral financial assistance to those programs in accordance
11 with the provisions of this section. This assistance may be
12 used, as approved by the Director, by community action
13 agencies in order to enable them to carry out their planning,
14 coordination, evaluation, and overall administration responsi-
15 bilities as described in part A of this title. It may also be
16 used for the development and operation of approved pro-
17 gram components which are necessary for a fully effective
18 program and for which assistance is not available, as needed,
19 from other sources. These component projects may involve,
20 without limitation, activities providing services, together
21 with necessary related facilities, designed to assist families
22 and individuals to secure and retain meaningful employment;
23 to make better use of available income in connection with
24 efforts for self-advancement; to attain basic educational skills

1 needed for employment, family self-help, or successful par-
2 ticipation in school; to better secure, use, and maintain hous-
3 ing required for a suitable living environment; to undertake
4 family planning consistent with personal and family goals,
5 religious and moral convictions; and to make more frequent
6 and effective use of programs available to help in overcom-
7 ing specific problems. Components providing these or other
8 services may be focused upon the needs of specific low-
9 income groups, such as the very young, youth, the elderly,
10 the unemployed, and persons receiving public assistance,
11 but shall wherever feasible be structured so as to foster family
12 participation and progress.

13 “(b) The Director may provide financial assistance to
14 a public or private nonprofit agency other than a community
15 action agency for activities of the kind described in subsection
16 (a) where he determines, after receiving and considering
17 comments of the community action agency, if any, that there
18 is good cause for the granting of such assistance and that
19 such action would be in furtherance of the policies applicable
20 to this title.

21 “(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or
22 regulations governing applications for assistance under this
23 section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each
24 applicant to secure the views of local public officials and
25 agencies in the community having a direct or substantial in-

1 terest in the application and to resolve all issues of coopera-
2 tion and possible duplication prior to its submission.

3 "SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

4 "SEC. 222. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet
5 or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor
6 which are common to a number of communities, the Director
7 may develop and carry on special programs under this
8 section. This authority shall be used only where the Direc-
9 tor determines that the objectives sought could not be effec-
10 tively achieved through the use of authorities under sections
11 220 and 221, including assistance to components or projects
12 based on models developed and promulgated by him. It
13 shall also be used only with respect to programs which (1)
14 involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely
15 coordinated with community action programs, (2) involve
16 significant new combinations of resources or new and inno-
17 vative approaches, and (3) are structured in a way that will,
18 within the limits of the type of assistance or activities con-
19 templated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of
20 this title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate
21 to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director
22 may provide financial assistance to public or private non-
23 profit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such
24 special programs; but he shall do so in a manner that will
25 encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted

1 projects in community action programs, with a view to mini-
2 mizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the
3 use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons
4 or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing
5 from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in
6 promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs
7 under this section shall include those described in the follow-
8 ing paragraphs:

9 “(1) A program to be known as ‘Project Head-
10 start’ focused upon children who have not reached the
11 age of compulsory school attendance which will provide
12 such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social,
13 and other services, as the Director finds will aid the chil-
14 dren to attain their full potential, together with appro-
15 priate activities to encourage the participation of parents
16 of such children and permit the effective use of parent
17 services.

18 “(2) A ‘legal services program’ to provide legal
19 advice and legal representation to persons when they
20 are unable to afford the services of a private attorney,
21 together with legal research and information, as appro-
22 priate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal in-
23 stitutions, or combinations thereof, in furtherance of the
24 cause of justice among persons living in poverty. Proj-
25 ects involving legal advice and representation shall be

1 carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a law-
2 yer-client relationship consistent with the best standards
3 of the legal profession. The Director shall establish
4 procedures to assure that the principal local bar associa-
5 tions in the area to be served by any proposed project
6 for legal advice and representation are afforded an ade-
7 quate opportunity to submit comments and recommenda-
8 tions on the proposal before it is approved or funded.

9 “(3) A ‘comprehensive health services program’ to
10 aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health
11 services projects focused upon the needs of urban and
12 rural areas having high concentrations of poverty and a
13 marked inadequacy of health services for the poor.
14 These projects shall be designed—

15 “(A) to make possible, with maximum fea-
16 sible use of existing agencies and resources, the pro-
17 vision of comprehensive health services, including
18 but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic,
19 treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and
20 follow-up services, together with necessary related
21 facilities and services; and

22 “(B) to assure that these services are made
23 readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are
24 furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs
25 and with their participation and wherever possible

1 are combined with, or included within, arrangements
2 for providing employment, education, social, or
3 other assistance needed by the families and individ-
4 uals served.

5 Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall
6 be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants
7 to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and
8 may be used, as necessary to pay the full costs of proj-
9 ects. Before approving any project, the Director shall
10 consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health
11 agencies and take such steps as may be required to
12 assure that the program will be carried on under com-
13 petent professional supervision and that existing agencies
14 providing related services are furnished all assistance
15 needed to permit them to plan for participation in the
16 program and for the necessary continuation of those
17 related services.

18 “(4) A program to be known as ‘Upward Bound’
19 designed to generate skills and motivation necessary
20 for success in education beyond high school among
21 young people from low-income backgrounds and inade-
22 quate secondary school preparation. Projects must
23 include arrangements to assure cooperation among one
24 or more institutions of higher education and one or more
25 secondary schools. They must include a curriculum

1 designed to develop the critical thinking, effective ex-
2 pression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-
3 secondary education success, necessary health services
4 and such recreational and cultural and group activities
5 as the Director determines may be appropriate.

6 “(b) In developing programs under subsection (a),
7 the Director shall give priority to programs involving serv-
8 ices or activities whose effectiveness has been tested in one
9 or more community action programs, or in connection with
10 other Federal, State, or local programs, public or private.
11 The Director shall also cooperate with Federal and State
12 agencies with a view to developing, pursuant to subsection
13 (a), programs which will supplement or improve programs
14 for which those agencies are responsible. Where appropri-
15 ate, he shall provide for the operation of programs under sub-
16 section (a) by other Federal or State agencies, pursuant to
17 delegations of authority or suitable agreements.

18 “(c) Programs under subsection (a) may include es-
19 sential training, research, and technical assistance directly
20 related to program development and implementation, and
21 funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in
22 the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect
23 to training, research, and technical assistance activities.

24 “(d) The Director shall provide for the continuing
25 evaluation of the effectiveness of all programs under this

1 section, including their impact in terms of the needs or prob-
2 lems at which they are directed, and their relationship to
3 and effect upon related programs. For this purpose, he
4 shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appro-
5 priate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever fea-
6 sible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a
7 National or State basis. The reports of such studies, together
8 with the comments of the Director and other agencies, if
9 any, thereon, shall be public records and shall be reflected
10 in the annual report of the Director.

11 “ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

12 “SEC. 223. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or
13 allocated for assistance in the development and implementa-
14 tion of community action programs pursuant to sections 220
15 and 221, and for special program projects referred to in sec-
16 tion 222 (a), and which are not subject to any other pro-
17 vision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall
18 allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam,
19 American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,
20 and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs.
21 He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of
22 those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and
23 procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be
24 allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest
25 available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on

1 the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance
2 recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the
3 average number of unemployed persons in each State as
4 compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of
5 related children living with families with incomes of less
6 than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That
7 part of any State's allotment which the Director determines
8 will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during
9 the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to the
10 original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to
11 assure that any amount so made available to any State in
12 excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other
13 States.

14 “(b) The Director may provide for the separate allot-
15 ment of funds for any special program referred to in section
16 222 (a). This allotment may be made in accordance with
17 the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made
18 in accordance with other criteria which he determines will
19 assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the rela-
20 tive incidence in each State of the needs or problems at
21 which the program is directed, except that in no event may
22 more than $12\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the funds for any one program
23 be used in any one State.

24 “(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial
25 assistance extended to a community action agency or other

1 agency pursuant to sections 220, 221, and 222 (a), for the
2 period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per
3 centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or
4 activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum
5 of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assist-
6 ance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in
7 accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria,
8 that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes
9 of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or
10 in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant,
11 equipment, or services.

12 “(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under
13 sections 220, 221, and 222 (a) unless the Director satisfies
14 himself (1) that the services to be provided under such pro-
15 gram will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, serv-
16 ices previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2)
17 that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed
18 to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not
19 be diminished in order to provide any contributions required
20 under subsection (c) or otherwise qualify for assistance
21 under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding
22 sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director
23 may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for
24 determinations covering situations where a strict application
25 of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or

1 otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be
2 achieved.

3 “PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

4 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

5 “SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or
6 through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assist-
7 ance to communities in developing, conducting, and adminis-
8 tering programs under this title, and (2) training for special-
9 ized or other personnel which is needed in connection with
10 those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purposes
11 of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial
12 assistance under this title, the Director may make special
13 assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise
14 it in the performance of functions related to the assisted
15 activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period
16 of more than two years in the case of any agency.

17 “STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

18 “SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial
19 assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with
20 State law, to enable those agencies—

21 “(1) to provide technical assistance to communities
22 and local agencies in developing and carrying out pro-
23 grams under this title;

24 “(2) to assist in coordinating State activities re-
25 lated to this title;

1 “(3) to advise and assist the Director in develop-
2 ing procedures and programs to promote the participa-
3 tion of States and State agencies in programs under this
4 title; and

5 “(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Eco-
6 nomic Opportunity Council established by section 631
7 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in
8 identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or ad-
9 ministrative requirements that operate to impede State
10 level coordination of programs related to this title, and
11 in developing methods or recommendations for over-
12 coming those problems.

13 “(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies,
14 the Director shall give preference to programs or activities
15 which are administered or coordinated by the agencies desig-
16 nated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been de-
17 veloped and will be carried on with the assistance of those
18 agencies.

19 “RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

20 “SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide
21 financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects con-
22 ducted by public or private agencies which are designed to
23 test or assist in the development of new approaches or
24 methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or

1 otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may
2 also contract or provide financial assistance for research per-
3 taining to the purposes of this title.

4 “(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to
5 govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and
6 the use of all research authority under this title. The plan
7 shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities
8 among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Direc-
9 tor shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose
10 of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects
11 and determining whether the findings resulting from any
12 research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or
13 more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As
14 part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a
15 separate annual report, the Director shall submit a descrip-
16 tion for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this
17 section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings
18 derived from those activities, together with a statement indi-
19 cating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in
20 which the benefits of those activities and findings are ex-
21 pected to be realized.

22 “(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appro-
23 priated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall
24 be used for the purposes of subsection (a).

1 “PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

2 “RURAL AREAS

3 “SEC. 240. (a) In exercising authority under this title,
4 the Director shall take necessary steps to further the exten-
5 sion of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with
6 the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents,
7 and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical
8 competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These
9 steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1)
10 the development under section 222 (a) of programs partic-
11 ularly responsive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the
12 establishment, pursuant to section 232 (a), of a program
13 of research and pilot project activities specifically focused
14 upon the problems of rural poverty; (3) the provision of
15 technical assistance so as to afford a priority to agencies
16 in rural communities and to aid those agencies, through such
17 arrangements as may be appropriate, in securing assistance
18 under Federal programs which are related to this title but
19 which are not generally utilized in rural areas; and (4) the
20 development of special or simplified procedures, forms, guide-
21 lines, model components, and model programs for use in
22 rural areas.

23 “(b) In order to further implement the policy described
24 in subsection (a), the Director shall establish criteria de-

1 signed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under
2 this title within the States between urban and rural areas.
3 In developing those criteria, he shall consider the relative
4 numbers in the States or areas therein of (1) low-income
5 families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed
6 persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on
7 a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations;
8 (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-
9 grade education; and (6) persons rejected for military
10 service.

11 “(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title,
12 the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in
13 rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any
14 project for which assistance to community action agencies is
15 authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish
16 a community action agency within a reasonable period of
17 time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such
18 conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote
19 adherence to the purposes of this title and the early estab-
20 lishment of a community action agency in the area.

21 “(d) The Director shall encourage the development of
22 programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertak-
23 ing of common or related projects, and other methods of
24 cooperation between urban and rural communities, with par-

1 ticular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where
2 it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and be-
3 tween larger urban communities with concentrations of low-
4 income persons and families and rural areas in which sub-
5 stantial numbers of those persons and families have recently
6 resided.

7 "COORDINATION—FEDERAL AGENCIES; USE OF STATE
8 FUNDS

9 "SEC. 241. (a) The heads of all Federal agencies shall
10 cooperate with the Director in carrying out his responsibili-
11 ties under this title and shall, to the extent permitted by law,
12 exercise their powers so as to encourage implementation of
13 the purposes of this title with respect to all programs appro-
14 priate for inclusion in community action programs. The
15 Director may call upon other Federal agencies for advice,
16 information, or assistance, including the establishment of
17 working groups of Federal personnel, in dealing with specific
18 problems of coordination arising under programs authorized
19 in this title. Cooperative actions or undertakings initiated
20 pursuant to this subsection may include evaluation of local
21 programs on a common or joint basis, and actions to assist
22 particular communities in overcoming problems arising out of
23 diverse Federal requirements, or in developing long-range
24 plans where justified by prior progress.

25 " (b) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Presi-

1 dent, where funds are advanced for a single project by more
2 than one Federal agency to a community action agency or
3 other agency assisted under this title, any one Federal agency
4 may be designated to act for all in administering the funds
5 advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement
6 may be established according to the proportion of funds
7 advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive
8 any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by
9 such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar re-
10 quirements of the administering agency or which the admin-
11 istering agency does not impose.

12 “(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of
13 funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State
14 agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States
15 or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents
16 of the United States for purposes of providing financial as-
17 sistance to community action agencies or other local agencies
18 in connection with specific projects or programs involving
19 the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this
20 title.

21 “SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

22 “SEC. 242. In carrying out the provisions of this title,
23 no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall
24 be made with, or provided to, any State or local public

1 agency or any private institution or organization for the
2 purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other ac-
3 tivity within a State unless a plan setting forth such pro-
4 posed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance
5 has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such
6 plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty
7 days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been re-
8 considered by the Director and found by him to be fully
9 consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the
10 purposes of this part. This section shall not, however, apply
11 to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance
12 to any institution of higher education in existence on the
13 date of the approval of this Act.

14 "FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

15 "SEC. 243. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency
16 receiving financial assistance under this title until it has sub-
17 mitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted
18 agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for per-
19 formance of any major portion of the assisted program) have
20 established an accounting system with internal controls ade-
21 quate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and relia-
22 bility of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency
23 and encourage compliance with prescribed management poli-
24 cies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting
25 requirements as the Director may establish. The statement

1 may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly
2 licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency,
3 the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsi-
4 bility for providing required financial services to that agency.

5 “(b) Within three months after the effective date of a
6 grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or
7 agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a pre-
8 liminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy
9 of the accounting system and internal controls established
10 thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement
11 referred to in paragraph (a). Promptly after the comple-
12 tion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis
13 of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether
14 the accounting systems and internal controls meet those
15 standards and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or con-
16 tract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall
17 be given not more than six months within which to establish
18 the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of fail-
19 ure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall be
20 terminated by the Director.

21 “(c) At least once annually the Director shall make or
22 cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assist-
23 ance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such
24 audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings
25 and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures

1 incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance,
2 the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by
3 appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate
4 increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any
5 grant or contract with the same agency or organization
6 which is then in effect or which is entered into within
7 twelve months after the date of disallowance.

8 “(d) The Director shall establish such other require-
9 ments and take such actions as he may deem necessary and
10 appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and
11 to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the
12 effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with
13 programs assisted under this title. These requirements and
14 actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that
15 the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial
16 assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its
17 approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to
18 promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or
19 components of community action programs receiving financial
20 assistance under this title, including provision for the periodic
21 reprogramming and supplementation of assistance previously
22 provided.

23 “SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

24 “SEC. 244. The following special limitations shall
25 apply, as indicated, to programs under this title.

1 “(1) Financial assistance under this title may in-
2 clude funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attend-
3 ance at meetings of any community action agency gov-
4 erning board, neighborhood council or committee, as
5 appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum fea-
6 sible participation of members of groups and residents of
7 areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title,
8 and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses con-
9 nected with those meetings; but those funds (or match-
10 ing non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allow-
11 ances in the case of any individual who is a Federal,
12 State, or local government employee, or an employee of
13 a community action agency, or for payment of an allow-
14 ance to any individual for attendance at more than two
15 meetings a month.

16 “(2) The Director shall issue necessary rules or
17 regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carry-
18 ing out community action program activities receiving
19 financial assistance under this title is compensated from
20 funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per
21 annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee
22 at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be
23 considered in determining whether the non-Federal con-
24 tributions requirements of section 223 have been com-
25 plied with; the Director may, however, provide in those

1 rules or regulations for exceptions covering cases where,
2 because of the need for specialized or professional skills
3 or prevailing local wage levels, application of the fore-
4 going restriction would greatly impair program effec-
5 tiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes
6 sought to be achieved.

7 “(3) No officer or employee of the Office of Eco-
8 nomic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board,
9 council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee,
10 contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a
11 program receiving financial assistance under this title;
12 but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from
13 serving on a board, council, or committee which does
14 not have any authority or powers in connection with a
15 program assisted under this title.

16 “(4) In granting financial assistance for projects
17 or activities in the field of family planning, the Director
18 shall assure that family planning services, including the
19 dissemination of family planning information and medical
20 assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-
21 income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility
22 for assistance under this part which have been established
23 by the assisted agency and who desire such information,
24 assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in
25 connection with any such financial assistance, that—

1 “(A) no individual will be provided with any
2 information, medical supervision, or supplies which
3 that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or
4 her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

5 “(B) no individual will be provided with any
6 medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has
7 voluntarily requested such medical supervision or
8 supplies.

9 The use of family planning services assisted under this
10 title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services
11 from or participation in any other programs under this
12 Act.

13 “(5) No financial assistance shall be extended un-
14 der this title to provide general aid to elementary or
15 secondary education in any school or school system;
16 but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, reme-
17 dial, and other noncurricular assistance.

18 “(6) In extending assistance under this title the
19 Director shall give special consideration to programs
20 which make maximum use of existing schools, commu-
21 nity centers, settlement houses, and other facilities dur-
22 ing times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

23 “DURATION OF PROGRAM

24 “SEC. 245. The Director shall carry out the programs
25 provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June

1 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each
2 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the
3 Congress may authorize by law.”

4 AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

5 SEC. 104. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity
6 Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately un-
7 der the title heading a new part heading to read “PART A—
8 RURAL LOAN PROGRAM”, and (2) striking out the heading
9 immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof
10 a new heading to read “LOANS TO FAMILIES”.

11 (b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as
12 follows:

13 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

14 “SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some
15 of the special needs of low-income rural families by estab-
16 lishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintain-
17 ing their income and living standards.”

18 (c) Section 302 (a) of such Act is amended by insert-
19 ing the word “principal” after the word “aggregate”.

20 (d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI
21 thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as
22 section 306, and amended by striking out “titles III of this
23 Act” in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu
24 thereof “this part”.

(e) Part B of title III of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEASONALLY EMPLOYED, FARMWORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

“STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

“SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly complex and technological society.

“FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

“SEC. 312. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions and cooperatives in developing and carrying out programs to fulfill the purpose of this part.

“(b) Programs assisted under this part may include projects or activities—

“(1) to meet the immediate needs of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families, such as day care for children, education, health services, improved housing and sanitation, legal advice and representation, and consumer training and counseling;

“(2) to promote increased community acceptance

1 or migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families;
2 and

3 “(3) to equip unskilled migrant and seasonal farm-
4 workers through education and training to meet the
5 changing demands in agricultural employment brought
6 about by technological advancement and to take advan-
7 tage of opportunities available to improve their well-
8 being and self-sufficiency by gaining regular or perma-
9 nent employment or by participating in available
10 Government training programs.

11 “LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

12 “SEC. 313. (a) Assistance shall not be extended under
13 this part unless the Director determines that the applicant
14 will maintain its prior level of effort in similar activities.

15 “(b) The Director shall establish necessary procedures
16 or requirements to assure that programs under this part are
17 carried on in coordination with other programs or activities
18 providing assistance to the persons and groups served.

19 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION

20 “SEC. 314. (a) The Director may provide directly or
21 through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, such tech-
22 nical assistance or training of personnel as may be required
23 to implement effectively the purposes of this title.

24 “(b) The Director shall provide for necessary evalua-

tion of projects under this title and may, through grants or contracts, secure independent evaluation for this purpose.”

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND

COORDINATION

SEC. 105. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “four” in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof “six”.

(b) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“DEFINITIONS

“SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

“(1) the term ‘State’ means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning of ‘State’ shall also include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 223 of this Act this term means only a State or the District of Columbia. The term ‘United States’ when used in a geographical sense includes all those places named in the previous sentence, and all other places continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

“(2) the term ‘financial assistance’ when used in

1 titles, I, II, and III-B includes assistance advanced by
2 grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the
3 procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services;
4 and

5 “(3) the term ‘permanent resident of the United
6 States’ when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any
7 native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United
8 States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee sub-
9 sequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of
10 sections 214 (a) or 212 (d) (5), respectively, or any
11 person admitted as a conditional entrant under section
12 203 (a) (7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act.”

13 (c) Section 610-1 (a) of such Act is amended by
14 inserting the words “a substantial number of the” immedi-
15 ately before the word “persons” the second and third time
16 that word appears.

17 (d) Section 616 of such Act is amended to read as
18 follows:

19 “TRANSFER OF FUNDS

20 “SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appro-
21 priations for any program or activity under this Act or any
22 Act authorizing appropriations for such program or activity,
23 not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or
24 allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling
25 the Director to carry out any such program or activity under

1 the Act may be transferred and used by the Director for the
2 purpose of carrying out any other such program or activity
3 under the Act; but no such transfer shall result in increasing
4 the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity
5 by more than 10 per centum.”

6 (e) Title VI of such Act is amended by—

7 (1) striking out section 604;

8 (2) striking out the heading “PART B—COORDI-
9 NATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS” and sections
10 611, 612, 613, and 614; and

11 (3) inserting at the end thereof a new part B to
12 read as follows:

13 “PART B—COORDINATION

14 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

15 “SEC. 630. This part establishes an Economic Oppor-
16 tunity Council, provides for an information center, and pre-
17 scribes certain duties and responsibilities. Its purpose is to
18 promote better coordination among all programs related to
19 this Act, with a view to making those programs more effec-
20 tive in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State and
21 local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to varying
22 local problems and conditions, stimulating new and more
23 imaginative ways of combining complementary Federal re-
24 sources in the solution of specific problems, and generally
25 improving cooperation and communication among all levels

1 of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related
2 to the purposes of this Act.

3 "ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

4 "SEC. 631. (a) There is established an Economic Op-
5 portunity Council. The Council shall include the Director
6 who shall be Chairman, the Attorney General, the Secretaries
7 of Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor,
8 Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban
9 Development, the Administrator of the Small Business
10 Administration, the Chairman of the Council of Economic
11 Advisers, and the Director of Selective Service. The Presi-
12 dent, in his discretion, may from time to time revise the
13 membership of the Council to take account of changes in
14 functions or otherwise assure representation on the Council
15 that will best promote the purposes of this part. Each mem-
16 ber shall designate an alternative to sit in his stead in the
17 event of his unavoidable absence.

18 "(b) It shall be the responsibility of the Council to
19 consult with and advise the President and the Director in
20 carrying out their functions, including the coordination of
21 antipoverty efforts by all segments of the government. In
22 doing so, the Council shall—

23 "(1) advise generally on the coordination of Fed-
24 eral programs related to this Act;

1 “(2) review and make recommendations, as appro-
2 priate, with respect to major policy issues and questions
3 of basic priorities involving the coordination of programs
4 related to this Act;

5 “(3) initiate, consider, recommend, and, to the ex-
6 tent feasible, arrange for the carrying out of specific
7 actions or projects designed to improve coordination
8 among programs related to this Act; and

9 “(4) provide general guidance and advice in con-
10 nection with the operation of the information center
11 provided for in this part and assist the Director in mak-
12 ing the center more effective.

13 “(c) The Council may be provided a staff by the Di-
14 rector. Employees of other executive departments and agen-
15 cies may be detailed to the Council from time to time for
16 temporary assistance.

17 “(d) As directed by the President, or from time to time
18 as it deems appropriate, the Council shall report to the Presi-
19 dent concerning specific actions which it has taken, or pro-
20 poses to take, in carrying out its responsibilities. To the
21 extent appropriate, a report of the Council’s activities shall
22 be reflected in the Director’s annual report to the President
23 and the Congress or in a separate report to the President
24 for transmittal to the Congress.

“RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

1

2 “SEC. 632. In addition to his other powers under this
3 Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the anti-
4 poverty efforts of all Federal agencies, the Director shall—

5 “(1) undertake special studies of specific coordina-
6 tion problems at the request of the President or the
7 Council, or on his own initiative; and

8 “(2) carry on a continuing evaluation of all activi-
9 ties under this Act, and consult with interested agencies
10 and groups, including State agencies described in sec-
11 tion 231 of this Act and the National Advisory Council,
12 with a view to identifying coordination problems may
13 warrant consideration by the Council or the President
14 and, to the extent feasible or appropriate, initiate action
15 for overcoming those problems, either through the Office
16 of Economic Opportunity or in conjunction with other
17 Federal, State, or local agencies.

18 “COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

19 “SEC. 633. (a) Federal agencies administering pro-
20 grams related to this Act shall—

21 “(1) cooperate with the Director and with the
22 Council in carrying out their duties and responsibilities;
23 and

24 “(2) carry out their programs and exercise their
25 functions so as to assist in carrying out the provisions

1 and purposes of this Act, to the fullest extent permitted
2 by other applicable law.

3 “(b) The Council and the Director may call upon Fed-
4 eral agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and
5 other materials as they deem necessary to discharge their
6 responsibilities under this Act.

7 “(c) The President may direct that particular programs
8 and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of Federal
9 agencies shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent
10 with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support
11 of programs authorized under this Act.

12 “COMBINATIONS AMONG PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

13 “SEC. 634. In order to encourage efficiencies, close
14 unnecessary service gaps, and generally promote more effec-
15 tive administration, the Director shall require, to the fullest
16 extent feasible, that projects or programs assisted under this
17 Act be carried on so as to supplement one another, or where
18 appropriate other related programs or projects, and be in-
19 cluded within or otherwise carried on in combination with
20 community action programs. In the case of other programs
21 related to this Act, the heads of the Federal agencies respon-
22 sible for those programs shall, to the extent permitted by
23 law, similarly provide assistance for projects and activities in
24 a manner which encourages combinations with other related

1 projects and activities, where appropriate, and with commu-
2 nity action programs. The Economic Opportunity Council
3 shall, in carrying out its responsibilities under this part, make
4 a continuing review of the operation of this section with a
5 view to (1) determining particular groups of programs
6 which, because of their objectives, or similarities in target
7 groups or areas, are especially appropriate for combined or
8 closely coordinated operation at the State or local level, and
9 making recommendations accordingly to the President or
10 appropriate Federal officials; (2) evaluating Federal agency
11 procedures for carrying out this section, and developing or
12 recommending additional or common procedures, as appro-
13 priate; and (3) determining whether, and to what extent,
14 consolidations of Federal programs may be justified and
15 making recommendations respecting such consolidations to
16 the Director and the President.

17 "INFORMATION CENTER

18 "SEC. 635. (a) The Director shall establish and oper-
19 ate an information center for the purpose of insuring that
20 maximum use is made of Federal programs related to this
21 Act and that information concerning those programs and
22 other relevant information is readily available to public
23 officials and other interested persons. The Director shall
24 collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute informa-
25 tion as described above, either free of charge or by sale at

1 cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's
2 account as an offset of that cost), and may make arrange-
3 ments and pay for any printing and binding without regard
4 to the provisions of any other law or regulations. In con-
5 nection with operation of the center, the Director may carry
6 on research or studies concerning the improvement of in-
7 formation systems in support of the purposes of this Act, the
8 adequacy of existing data, ways in which data generated on
9 the State and local level may be incorporated into Federal
10 information systems, and methods by which data may be
11 made more readily available to State and local officials or
12 used to further coordination objectives.

13 “(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a
14 current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to in-
15 dividual and community improvement. He may also make
16 grants, from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this
17 Act, to States and communities to establish information
18 service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribu-
19 tion of information required to further the purposes of this
20 Act.

21 “(c) In order to assure that all appropriate officials are
22 kept fully informed of programs related to this Act, and
23 that maximum use is made of those programs, the Director
24 shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to
25 State and local agencies of all current information, including

1 administrative rules, regulations, and guidelines, required
2 by those agencies for the effective performance of their
3 responsibilities.

4 "PROHIBITION

5 "SEC. 636. In order to assure that existing Federal
6 agencies are used to the fullest extent possible in carrying
7 out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry
8 out this Act shall be used to establish any new department
9 or office when the intended function is being performed by
10 an existing department or office.

11 "SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: TRAINING PROGRAMS

12 "SEC. 637. (a) It shall be the responsibility of the
13 Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health,
14 Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other depart-
15 ments and agencies concerned, acting through such pro-
16 cedures or mechanisms as the President may prescribe, to
17 provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and
18 appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all
19 programs and activities within the executive branch of the
20 Government relating to the training of individuals for the
21 purpose of improving or restoring employability.

22 " (b) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agree-
23 ments as may be necessary or appropriate (which may in-
24 clude arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

25 " (1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-

1 State employment service provides and develops its
2 capacity for providing maximum support for the pro-
3 grams described in subsection (a) ; and

4 “ (2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the
5 Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Di-
6 rector of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the
7 head of any other Federal agency administering a train-
8 ing program, such employment information as will facil-
9 itate the placement of individuals being trained.

10 “DEFINITIONS

11 “SEC. 638. As used in this part, ‘programs related to
12 this Act’ and ‘coordination’ shall include the programs and
13 actions described in this section:

14 “ (1) ‘Programs related to this Act’ include pro-
15 grams under this Act and all Federal or federally assisted
16 programs which have objectives which are, in whole
17 or substantial part, complementary to the purposes of
18 this Act, or which provide resources which may be
19 used in combination with resources under this Act to
20 assist in achieving any of the purposes of this Act.

21 “ (2) ‘Coordination’ includes, but is not limited to—

22 “ (A) actions to improve the common effective-
23 ness of programs in reaching and serving the poor,
24 such as actions: to extend services to new areas,
25 provide them in a common place, or structure them

1 so that they are more readily accepted or widely
2 utilized; to eliminate procedures or requirements that
3 may be inappropriate for or result in unnecessary
4 hardship to disadvantaged persons with limited
5 education or other special handicaps; to establish
6 common eligibility standards among programs serv-
7 ing substantially similar groups or operating in the
8 same areas; or to develop methods of operation or
9 administration that will provide new employment
10 incentives or opportunities for the poor;

11 “(B) actions to promote better use at the State
12 or local level of Federal assistance available under
13 diverse programs, such as actions to establish pro-
14 cedures for cooperation among State or local agencies
15 seeking assistance from different Federal sources
16 with a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication
17 and service gaps and promoting common or comple-
18 mentary priorities; or to modify or improve tech-
19 nical or administrative requirements imposed by
20 different Federal agencies that may operate to
21 increase unnecessarily the burdens of State or local
22 agencies, minimize their opportunities for the imag-
23 inative use of Federal assistance, or discourage their
24 cooperation with one another;

25 “(C) actions to promote simplification and ef-

1 iciencies through the joint or combined use of
2 Federal resources, such as actions to develop new
3 methods of processing requests for assistance or
4 granting assistance that will enable Federal agencies
5 more generally to use resources jointly in support of
6 common objectives; to establish common priorities
7 for purposes of program planning, research and
8 demonstration activities; and to effect combinations
9 among or redirect Federal programs or activities for
10 the purpose of eliminating unnecessary duplication;

11 “(D) actions to improve communication and
12 general cooperation, such as actions to strengthen
13 ties among regional offices of different Federal agen-
14 cies and among such offices and other regional agen-
15 cies or organizations; to develop and improve proce-
16 dures by which Federal agencies may act together
17 in promulgating or making available items of in-
18 formation, including information as to the avail-
19 ability and allocation of funds, which are closely re-
20 lated to one another for purposes of State or local
21 planning and budgeting; or to develop procedures
22 by which State and local agencies may be afforded
23 new opportunities to participate in Federal policy
24 decisions, including decisions on recommended leg-

1 isolation, affecting their capacity to operate efficiently
2 and effectively.”

3 AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

4 SEC. 106. (a) Title VII of the Economic Opportunity
5 Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

6 “TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CER-
7 TAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

8 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

9 “SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to provide in-
10 centives to welfare recipients to participate in programs
11 under this Act which are designed to enable them to become
12 self-supporting, and to complete such programs and become
13 self-supporting within a reasonable period of time.

14 “STATE PLANS

15 “SEC. 702. Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I,
16 IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, a
17 State plan approved under any such title shall include pro-
18 visions consistent with the rules prescribed or under this title.

19 “DEFINITIONS

20 “SEC. 703. For the purposes of this title—

21 “(a) ‘Public assistance’ shall mean any aid or assist-
22 ance payable pursuant to a State plan approved under title I,
23 IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

24 “(b) ‘Trainee’ shall mean any person enrolled in any
25 program under title I, II, or III-B of this Act or employed

1 in any such program as a resident nonprofessional or in any
2 other combined work-and-training capacity.

3 “(c) ‘Qualifying income’ shall mean (1) any amount
4 paid as wages under title I of this Act to a trainee in a pro-
5 gram described in paragraph (1) of section 121 of the Act
6 (relating to Neighborhood Youth Corps programs for youth
7 attending school) ; (2) any amount paid under this Act as
8 wages, training allowance, or stipend to any other trainee
9 during his first eighteen months as such a trainee; and
10 (3) the net income derived, during the first eighteen months
11 following initial receipt of assistance under title III-A of
12 this Act, by any assisted family from the assisted farm or
13 nonagricultural enterprise.

14 “(d) ‘Poverty line’ shall mean an amount of monthly
15 income determined by the Director, representing an approxi-
16 mation of the minimum level of income which is necessary
17 to support a family of given size so that it can live out of
18 poverty.

19 “ATTRIBUTION OF INCOME

20 “SEC. 704. Unless otherwise provided in regulations pre-
21 scribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
22 no payment made under this Act to or on behalf of any
23 trainee shall be regarded as income or resources of any other
24 individual under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X,
25 XIV, XVI, or XIX except to the extent that the payment

1 is made available to or used for the benefit of such other
2 individual.

3 "AMOUNT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

4 "SEC. 705. (a) The amount of public assistance payable
5 for any month to any person having qualifying income shall
6 be the higher of (1) the amount determined under the State
7 plan without regard to this section, or (2) the amount deter-
8 mined under subsection (b).

9 "(b) The amount of public assistance which is payable
10 for any month to any person who receives qualifying income
11 shall be computed, for purposes of this subsection, as follows:

12 "(1) The amount of public assistance, excluding
13 assistance for medical care, shall be computed under the
14 State plan as if the qualifying income had not been re-
15 ceived (and without any provision for expenses con-
16 nected with earning the qualifying income).

17 "(2) The qualifying income for the month shall be
18 converted into a percentage of the monthly poverty line.

19 "(3) The amount of public assistance payable
20 (other than assistance for medical care) shall be the
21 amount determined under clause (1) above, reduced
22 by the percentage determined under clause (2) or, if
23 the State plan so provides, by eight-tenths of that
24 percentage.

25 "(4) Assistance for medical care shall be provided

1 in accordance with the State plan. In States where
2 the plan provides that assistance for medical care de-
3 pends upon eligibility for other public assistance, such
4 eligibility shall be determined in accordance with this
5 subsection.

6 “(c) If more than one member of a family receives
7 qualifying income, the qualifying income of all members of
8 the family shall be aggregated in determining the percentage
9 referred to in subsection (b) (2). The foregoing sentence
10 shall not apply in cases in which its application would be
11 inconsistent with section 704.

12 “SAVINGS PROVISION

13 “SEC. 706. If, at the time the rules prescribed in section
14 705 become effective in his State, a trainee’s public assist-
15 ance is being computed in accordance with the prior version
16 of this title, it shall continue to be so computed until (1)
17 his rights under the prior version expire, or (2) he com-
18 pletes his participation in the particular program in which
19 he is a trainee, whichever occurs sooner. Thereafter, if he
20 receives additional qualifying income, his public assistance
21 shall be determined in accordance with section 705.”

22 (b) In the case of any State whose State plan meets
23 the requirements of section 701 of the Economic Oppor-
24 tunity Act of 1964 in effect prior to the amendment made
25 by subsection (2) of this section, no funds to which the State

1 is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or
2 XIX of the Social Security Act shall be withheld prior to
3 January 1, 1968, as a result of such amendment; nor shall
4 funds be withheld from any such State by reason of any
5 action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents the
6 State from complying with the requirements of such amend-
7 ment until the first day of the fourth month after the State
8 legislature next adjourns following the effective date of this
9 Act.

10 VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

11 SEC. 107. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act
12 of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

13 "TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE
14 PROGRAMS

15 "VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

16 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

17 "SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-
18 time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-
19 term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer
20 programs, together with other powers and responsibilities
21 designed to assist in the development and coordination of
22 volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and
23 supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and
24 enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups,
25 including elderly and retired Americans, to perform mean-

1 ingful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or
 2 short-term programs in their home or nearby communities,
 3 and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban
 4 communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant work-
 5 ers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions,
 6 and situations where the application of human talent and
 7 dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps
 8 of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-
 9 advancement.

10 "PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

11 "AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

12 "SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and
 13 train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and
 14 upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private
 15 nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to
 16 work—

17 " (1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or
 18 related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migra-
 19 tory workers and their families, or of residents of the
 20 District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,
 21 Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the
 22 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

23 " (2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally
 24 ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit

1 mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in
2 their construction or operation by Federal funds; and

3 “(3) in connection with programs or activities au-
4 thorized, supported, or of a character eligible for
5 assistance under this Act.

6 “(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section
7 shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions
8 on political activities that appropriately recognize the special
9 status of volunteers living among the persons or groups
10 served by programs to which they have been assigned) as
11 the Director may determine; but volunteers under this part
12 shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without
13 the consent of the Governor.

14 "TERMS OF SERVICE

15 “SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be re-
16 quired to make a full-time personal commitment to combating
17 poverty. This shall include a commitment to live among
18 and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain
19 available for service without regard to regular working hours,
20 at all times during their term of service, except for author-
21 ized periods of leave.

22 “(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for
23 one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to train-
24 ing. The Director may, however, allow persons who are
25 unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as

1 volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than
2 two months where he determines that this more limited
3 service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

4 “(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and sub-
5 scribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by
6 section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001
7 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with
8 respect to that oath or affirmation.

9 “SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

10 “SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to
11 volunteers under this part while they are in training and on
12 assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month
13 during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide
14 a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons
15 who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance
16 with standards prescribed by him, have been designated
17 volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills.
18 The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel
19 (including travel to and from the place of training), and
20 leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment,
21 subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other
22 support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their
23 needs.

24 “(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of
25 a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances

1 the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend,
2 or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the
3 event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount
4 of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the
5 provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5
6 U.S.C. 5582).

7 “(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educa-
8 tional and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent
9 volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience
10 which they have derived from their training and service in
11 the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty
12 as members of the helping professions.

13 “PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER
14 PROGRAMS

15 “COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

16 “SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs
17 designed to expand opportunities for persons to partici-
18 pate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for
19 shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment
20 under section 810, and in their home or nearby communi-
21 ties, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination
22 of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or
23 arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical,
24 or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are
25 undertaken in connection with these programs. These

1 projects may include, without limitation, activities designed
2 (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to partici-
3 pate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted
4 under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs
5 designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2)
6 to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional,
7 or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for
8 the development or betterment of neighborhoods or areas
9 having especially large concentrations of the poor, with par-
10 ticular emphasis upon helping residents of those neighbor-
11 hoods or areas to develop the competence necessary to take
12 advantage of public and private resources which would not
13 otherwise be available or used for those programs; and (3)
14 to assist existing national and local agencies relying upon
15 or in need of volunteers to obtain volunteer services more
16 readily, or to provide specialized short-term training, with
17 particular emphasis on agencies serving the most seriously
18 disadvantaged, operating in areas of the most concentrated
19 poverty, or having similar critical needs.

20 “(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section
21 shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such
22 other support or allowances as the Director determines, pur-
23 suant to regulations, are required because of unusual or
24 special circumstances affecting the project.

1 “(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable
2 as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any pro-
3 gram or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act,
4 shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the
5 Director under this section in providing for or assisting in
6 the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such per-
7 son.

8 “SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

9 “SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or
10 provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs
11 designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of pro-
12 viding volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer
13 participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not
14 to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated
15 from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal
16 year may be used for programs under this section.

17 “PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

18 “COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

19 “SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to
20 coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title
21 with one another, with community action programs, and
22 with other related Federal, State, local, and national pro-
23 grams. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible,
24 actions to promote service by volunteers or former volun-
25 teers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in

1 providing necessary support to programs under part B,
2 and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or
3 short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A
4 as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director
5 shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State,
6 local, and national agencies responsible for programs related
7 to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging
8 greater use of volunteer services in those programs and
9 establishing in connection with them systematic procedures
10 for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orienta-
11 tion or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant
12 to this part.

13 "PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

14 "SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall
15 take necessary steps, including the development of special
16 projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest feasible
17 participation of older persons in the various programs and
18 activities authorized under this title.

19 "APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

20 "SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b),
21 volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal
22 employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws
23 relating to Federal employment.

24 "(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance
25 or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services

1 or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter
2 III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, per-
3 sons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Gov-
4 ernment, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same
5 extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116 (a)
6 (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of
7 the computation described in 116 (a) (2) (B) the monthly
8 pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under
9 the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5,
10 United States Code.

11 "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

12 "SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations
13 to assure that service under this title is limited to activities
14 which would not otherwise be performed and which will not
15 result in the displacement of employed workers or impair
16 existing contracts for service.

17 "(b) All support, including transportation provided to
18 volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest
19 possible cost consistent with the effective operations of
20 volunteer programs.

21 "(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are
22 assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any
23 volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any
24 compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such
25 agency or organization.

1 “DURATION OF PROGRAM

2 “SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs
3 provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June
4 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each
5 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the
6 Congress may authorize by law.”

7 TITLE II—SUMMER CAMPS FOR DISADVAN-
8 TAGED CHILDREN

9 SHORT TITLE

10 SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the “Summer Camp
11 Act of 1967”.

12 FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

13 SEC. 202. Millions of acres of forest and park lands
14 throughout the Nation are the property of all the people.
15 Yet the circumstances of poverty frequently prevent the
16 utilization of these lands by those most in need, particularly
17 disadvantaged children who would benefit from outdoor and
18 camping experiences. It is the purpose of this title to pro-
19 vide and assist in the provision of camp facilities which per-
20 mit greater use of such public lands under Federal, State,
21 and local administration in behalf of these children.

22 BASIC AUTHORITY

23 SEC. 203. (a) The Director of the Office of Economic
24 Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the “Director”)
25 may allocate funds to other Federal agencies, or extend

1 financial assistance to State or local public agencies, to enable
2 them to provide camp facilities for use by disadvantaged chil-
3 dren. The following basic conditions shall apply to the
4 exercise of this authority—

5 (1) the facilities (except as may be necessary in
6 connection with access roads, utility lines, or similar in-
7 stallations) must be on public lands;

8 (2) the facilities must be so located in relation to
9 population centers as to permit their efficient, meaningful,
10 and substantial use in connection with camping pro-
11 grams, projects, or activities for disadvantaged children;
12 and

13 (3) the facilities must be provided and operated
14 subject to a use plan, conforming to the requirements of
15 section 205, which provides reasonable assurance of
16 their continuing availability, under the sponsorship of
17 one or more public or private nonprofit agencies, for
18 such camping programs, projects, or activities.

19 **ALLOCATION AND USE OF FUNDS**

20 **SEC. 204.** (a) Funds appropriated under this title may
21 be allocated by the Director to the Secretaries of Agricul-
22 ture, the Interior, or to the Army, to pay the cost of camp
23 facilities on public lands under their administration, or to the
24 head of any other Federal agency responsible for the admin-
25 istration of public lands which are determined by the Director

1 and the head of that agency to be appropriate for use in
2 providing camp facilities pursuant to this Act. Funds may
3 also be provided, by grant or contract, to State or local public
4 agencies responsible for administration of public lands and
5 having the legal, technical, and financial capacity to under-
6 take projects for the provision of camp facilities in accord-
7 ance with this title.

8 (b) Funds allocated to a Federal agency, or made avail-
9 able for any State or local project, may be used for—

10 (1) the construction, renovation, or improvement
11 (including furnishing and equipping) of camp facilities;

12 (2) the purchase or lease of privately owned facili-
13 ties on public lands which are or may be made suitable
14 for use as camp facilities; and

15 (3) essential maintenance and supervision of camp
16 facilities to the extent, as may be agreed upon by the Di-
17 rector and the agency concerned, that such maintenance
18 and supervision is not otherwise available or cannot
19 otherwise be reasonably provided.

20 (c) Funds allocated or made available under this title
21 may not be used for the administration or operation of any
22 camping program or project, nor may they be used for the
23 purchase of land; but this shall not preclude their use in
24 acquiring necessary rights in connection with access roads,
25 utility lines, or similar installations.

USE PLANS

1
2 SEC. 205. (a) Funds shall not be allocated and used
3 by a Federal agency for any facility, and the Director shall
4 not extend financial assistance to any State or local agency
5 project, unless the facility or project is covered by a use plan
6 or agreement approved by the Director in accordance with
7 this section. In the case of facilities to be provided by a
8 Federal agency, the plan shall contain such information and
9 understandings concerning the character of the facility, the
10 type and extent of use to be made of it, the number and
11 nature of and procedure for selecting sponsoring organiza-
12 tions, conformity with the rules and regulations of the admin-
13 istering agency, and other matters, as may be agreed upon
14 by the Director and the head of that agency. In the case of
15 projects of State or local public bodies, the plan shall contain,
16 at a minimum, information and commitments necessary to
17 assure—

18 (1) that the facilities will be adequate, and reason-
19 able in cost, in relation to their proposed use;

20 (2) that the facilities and their proposed use will
21 comply with all applicable laws and regulations and
22 be consistent with any applicable plans or planning,
23 including any statewide outdoor recreation plans ap-
24 proved pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation
25 Act of 1965;

1 (3) that the facilities will be available for use in
2 accordance with this title over an appropriate minimum
3 period, consistent with their cost, and that they will not
4 be converted to any other use during that period except
5 with the approval of the Director and subject to such
6 additional conditions or requirements (which may in-
7 clude required repayment of all or part of the financial
8 assistance, as determined after opportunity for hearing)
9 as the Director may prescribe;

10 (4) that the agency seeking financial assistance
11 will retain sufficient continuing control over the facilities
12 to assure their continuing use in accordance with this
13 title over the applicable minimum period; and

14 (5) that there are public or private nonprofit
15 sponsoring organizations (which may include the appli-
16 cant agency) which are able and willing to assume
17 responsibility for operating or coordinating the operation
18 of the facilities so as to assure their effective and efficient
19 use for camping programs for disadvantaged children,
20 and that there are adequate methods or procedures for
21 selecting those sponsoring organizations.

22 (b) The Director, after consultation with the heads of
23 interested Federal agencies, may by regulation prescribe
24 additional or supplementary requirements or criteria for
25 use plans. Such regulations may include descriptions of dif-

1 ferent types of camping programs for which facilities pro-
2 vided or assisted under this title may be used, general
3 standards for these various types of programs, and require-
4 ments or procedures for selecting sponsoring organizations
5 in accordance with their capacity to provide or arrange for
6 the staff, health care, food, transportation, and other sup-
7 portive services needed for such programs. The regulations
8 may also require specific approval of sponsoring organiza-
9 tions by the Director.

10 USE OF FACILITIES BY OTHER THAN THE DISADVANTAGED

11 SEC. 206. Facilities provided or assisted under this title
12 shall not be used for groups other than disadvantaged chil-
13 dren unless it is determined, by the Director or in accord-
14 ance with regulations promulgated by him establishing
15 criteria for such determinations, that the facilities would
16 otherwise not be adequately utilized, that it is not reason-
17 ably possible to expand their use for disadvantaged children,
18 and that use by other organizations or groups would not
19 preclude or be inconsistent with the fullest practicable use
20 of the facilities for disadvantaged children. The Director
21 shall consult with the Federal agencies concerned and, where
22 feasible, with interested State and local agencies in issuing
23 regulations under this section. Those regulations may pro-
24 vide for use by groups other than disadvantaged children on
25 a fee basis, and may require in the case of any State or local

1 public agencies that fees so collected be applied in reduc-
2 tion of the amount of financial assistance provided under
3 this title.

4 EMPLOYMENT OF LOW-INCOME PERSONS

5 SEC. 207. To the extent feasible, the Director shall en-
6 courage the provision, maintenance, supervision, and use of
7 camp facilities in a manner that will promote new or addi-
8 tional employment or training opportunities for low-income
9 individuals, including individuals enrolled in the Job Corps,
10 the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other programs de-
11 signed to improve or restore employability.

12 LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

13 SEC. 208. Financial assistance under this title to any
14 State or local public agency for any project or activity shall
15 not exceed 80 per centum of the approved cost of such project
16 or activity. Nor shall the Director provide such assistance to
17 any such agency unless he satisfies himself that the prior
18 level of agency expenditures in connection with other facil-
19 ities available to disadvantaged children has not been and
20 will not be reduced and that contributions or expenditures
21 in connection with those other facilities will not be diminished
22 in order to provide any non-Federal contributions required
23 under this section. Non-Federal contributions required by
24 this section may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, includ-
25 ing but not limited to materials, equipment, and services.

LABOR STANDARDS

1
2 SEC. 209. All laborers and mechanics employed by con-
3 tractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration,
4 or repair, including painting and decorating, of projects,
5 buildings, and works which are federally assisted under this
6 title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevail-
7 ing on similar construction in the locality as determined
8 by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-
9 Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The
10 Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor
11 standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorgan-
12 ization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64
13 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934,
14 as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276 (c)).

GENERAL PROVISIONS

15
16 SEC. 210. To the extent necessary or appropriate to
17 carry out the provisions of this title, the Director shall have
18 the powers and duties conferred upon him by section 602
19 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, except that he
20 may make arrangements with, reimburse, or delegate any
21 powers to, the heads of other Federal agencies, including
22 agencies to which funds are allocated under section 204 (a) ,
23 and authorize redelegations, without regard to the provisions
24 of section 602 (d) of such Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 211. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term “camp facilities” includes permanent or semipermanent structures, sanitary, water, cooking, electrical or similar installations or fixtures, access roads and utility lines and installations necessary for adequate development of a site, recreational installations appropriate to a campsite, and such other furnishings, equipment, installations, or structures as may be required to provide a site appropriate for regular or repeated use in connection with camping programs for disadvantaged children;

(2) The term “State or local public agency” means a State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity or public body, an Indian tribe, or two or more such entities, bodies, or tribes, having necessary control over public lands and otherwise authorized to undertake the commitments required pursuant to this title with respect to any camp facility;

(3) The term “public lands” means those lands under the ownership, control, or administration of Federal, State, or local public agencies or Indian tribes;

(4) The term “sponsoring organization” means a welfare, youth, charitable, church, or labor organization,

1 a school, civic club, or community action agency estab-
2 lished pursuant to title II of the Economic Opportunity
3 Act of 1964, or any other public or private nonprofit
4 agency (other than a political party) which has au-
5 thority to operate, administer, or coordinate camping
6 programs for disadvantaged children using facilities pro-
7 vided under this title; and

8 (5) The term "disadvantaged children" means
9 children from low-income families, and includes groups
10 predominantly or principally composed of such children.

11 AUTHORIZATIONS

12 SEC. 212. For the purposes of carrying out this title,
13 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
14 \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and
15 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding
16 fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary. Sums so appro-
17 priated shall remain available until expended.

18 TITLE III—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

19 SEC. 301. (a) Whoever, being an officer, director,
20 agent, or employee of, or connected in any capacity with, any
21 agency receiving financial assistance under the Economic
22 Opportunity Act, as amended, embezzles, willfully mis-
23 applies, steals, or obtains by fraud any of the moneys, funds,
24 assets, or property which are the subject of a grant or con-
25 tract of assistance pursuant to the Economic Opportunity

1 Act, as amended, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or
2 imprisoned for not more than two years, or both; but if the
3 amount so embezzled, misapplied, stolen, or obtained by
4 fraud does not exceed \$100, he shall be fined not more than
5 \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

6 (b) Whoever, by threat of procuring dismissal of any
7 person from employment or of refusal to employ or refusal
8 to renew a contract of employment in connection with a
9 grant or contract of assistance under the Economic Oppor-
10 tunity Act, as amended, induces any person to give up
11 any money or thing of any value to any person (including
12 such grantee agency), shall be fined not more than \$1,000
13 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

A BILL

To provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Clark

APRIL 14, 1967

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor
and Public Welfare

institution's total assets at the end of the preceding fiscal year; or

(C) Make any payment to any affiliate under any agreement referred to in (B) above where the institution has previously paid to affiliates during the preceding 12 month period, pursuant to any such agreement, an amount aggregating in excess of the lesser of \$100,000 or 0.1% of the institution's total assets at the end of the preceding fiscal year.

The exception from the requirement of prior Corporation approval of those transactions and agreements where the consideration or payments made thereunder do not exceed the above-mentioned dollar limitations would, of course, relieve the Corporation of the necessity of passing upon numerous applications for its approval of matters of a routine nature or of little or no consequence. Where prior approval is required, the bill provides that the Corporation shall grant approval if, in its opinion, the terms of the transaction or agreement, or the payment by the institution, would not be detrimental to the interests of its savings account holders or to the insurance risk of the Corporation with respect to the institution.

Subsection (e). Acquisitions:—(1) (A) The bill would extend the proscription of the present statute against additional acquisitions of insured institutions (see subsection (c) of section 408) by making it unlawful for any savings and loan holding company or subsidiary thereof—(i) to acquire control of an insured or uninsured institution, or to retain control of such an institution acquired or retained in violation of section 408 as heretofore or hereafter in effect, (ii) to acquire, by the process of merger, consolidation, or purchase of assets, another insured or uninsured institution or a savings and loan holding company, or all or substantially all of the assets of any such institution or holding company, (iii) to acquire by purchase or otherwise, or to retain for more than 1 year after the enactment of the proposed bill, any of the voting shares of an insured institution or of a savings and loan holding company, not a subsidiary or more than 5% of the voting shares of any company not a subsidiary which is engaged in any business activity other than those specified in subsection (c) (2) of the bill, or (iv) to retain for more than 3 years after the enactment of the proposed bill, control of an insured institution the principal office of which is located in a state other than the state which the holding company shall designate, by writing filed with the Corporation, as the state in which the principal savings and loan business of such holding company is conducted.

(B) Any company (not a savings and loan holding company) would be prohibited from acquiring or retaining control of more than one insured institution. This provision is similar to subsection (c) (1) of the present section 408 and is designed to prevent the creation of new holding company systems by the simultaneous acquisition of control of a number of insured institutions.

(2) This paragraph incorporates the provisions of section 103 of the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966, which amended subsection (c) of the present section 408. Thus, the prohibitions against additional acquisitions in subparagraphs (A) (i), (A) (ii), and (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (e) would not apply to any transaction which has been approved by the Corporation upon a determination by it that such acquisition is advisable to assist in preventing the commencement or continuance of involuntary liquidation of an insured institution.

(3) A savings and loan holding company which is an insured bank of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation could, without regard to the provisions of subsection (e), acquire the control of an insured institution

or a savings and loan holding company, pursuant to a pledge of hypothecation to secure a loan, or in connection with the liquidation of a loan; but it would be unlawful for any such company to retain such control for more than 1 year, except that the Corporation could extend such period from year to year, for not more than 5 years; if it found that such extension is warranted and would not be detrimental to the public interest.

Subsection (f). Declaration of dividends:—Every subsidiary insured institution would be required to give the Corporation 30 days advance notice of the proposed declaration of any cash dividend on its guarantee, permanent, or other nonwithdrawable stock. Any such dividend declared within such 30 day period, or without the giving of notice to the Corporation, would be invalid.

Subsection (g). Holding company indebtedness:—(1) No savings and loan holding company or subsidiary could issue, sell, renew, or guaranty any debt security of such company or subsidiary, or assume any debt, without the prior approval of the Corporation.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) would not apply to short term indebtedness (payable on demand or maturing within 9 months) which aggregates, together with all such other short term debt as to which the holding company or subsidiary is primarily or contingently liable, not more than 5% of the consolidated net worth of such company or subsidiary at the end of the preceding fiscal year.

(3) The Corporation would, upon application, approve any act or transaction not exempted from the application of paragraph (1) if it found that—

(A) The proceeds would be used for (i) the purchase of permanent, guarantee, or other nonwithdrawable stock to be issued by a subsidiary insured institution, or (ii) the purpose of making a capital contribution to such an institution; or

(B) Such act or transaction is required for the purposes of refunding, extending, exchanging, or discharging an outstanding debt, or for other necessary or urgent corporate needs, and would not impose an unreasonable or imprudent financial burden on the applicant.

(4) No act or transaction within the scope of this subsection would be approved unless the Corporation is satisfied that there has been compliance with all State or Federal laws applicable thereto.

(5) This paragraph defines the term "debt security".

Subsection (h). Administration and enforcement:—(1) The Corporation would be authorized to issue such rules, regulations, and orders as it deems necessary or appropriate to enable it to administer section 408 and to require compliance therewith.

(2) The Corporation could make investigations to determine whether the provisions of section 408 and rules, regulations, and orders thereunder are being complied with by holding companies and subsidiaries and affiliates thereof. For the purpose of any hearing, investigation, or other proceeding under this section, the Corporation or its designated representatives could issue subpoenas and subpoenas duces tecum; it could require the attendance of witnesses and the production of books and records from any place in the United States; and the Corporation could apply to the United States district courts for the enforcement of such subpoenas.

(3) The Corporation would also be authorized to apply to the United States district courts for orders enjoining the commission of any acts or practices in violation of the proposed section 408, or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, or enforcing compliance therewith. Thus, for example, if the Corporation determined that a savings and loan holding company or a subsidiary thereof had acquired control of an

insured institution in violation of the Act, or was engaging in or performing proscribed activities or services, the Corporation could apply to the proper United States district court for an appropriate order of divestiture of such control or for an order requiring compliance with the provisions of the Act.

(4) All expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board or of the Corporation under section 408 would be considered as nonadministrative expenses.

Subsection (i). Prohibited acts:—It would be unlawful for (1) any holding company or subsidiary thereof, or any director, officer, employee, or person owning, controlling, or holding more than 10% of the voting shares of such holding company or subsidiary, to hold, solicit, or exercise any proxies in respect of any voting rights in an insured mutual institution, or (2) any director, officer, or person owning, controlling, or holding more than 10% of the voting shares of a holding company to (A) serve at the same time as a director, officer, or employee of an insured institution or another savings and loan holding company, not a subsidiary of such holding company, or (B) to acquire control, or to retain control for more than 2 years after enactment of the bill, of any insured institution, not a subsidiary of such holding company. The above-mentioned prohibitions would be consistent with other provisions of the proposed bill, and the present statute, prohibiting further holding company acquisitions of insured institutions.

(3) It would also be unlawful for any individual, except with the prior approval of the Corporation, to serve or act as a director, officer, or trustee of, or become a partner in, any savings and loan holding company after having been convicted of any criminal offense involving dishonesty or breach of trust.

Subsection (j). Penalties: For the wilful violation of any provision of the proposed section 408 or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, the offending company or individual would be subject to criminal sanctions and, upon conviction, the company would be subject to a fine of not more than \$1,000 for each day the violation continued, and the individual would be subject to a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Moreover, every director, officer, partner, trustee, agent, or employee of a holding company would be subject to the same penalties for false entries in any book, report, or statement of such holding company as are applicable to officers, agents, and employees of insured institutions for false entries in any books, reports, or statements of such institution under 18 U.S.C. 1006. This provision corresponds to section 8 of the Bank Holding Company Act. See 12 U.S.C. 1847.

Subsection (k). Saving clause: This section provides that nothing contained in the bill shall be construed as approving any act or conduct in violation of law, or shall constitute a defense to any action involving violation of the antitrust laws.

It is anticipated that the Congressional Committees giving consideration to the proposed bill will, by appropriate provisions added by the bill to the Internal Revenue Code, afford tax relief to savings and loan holding companies and shareholders thereof of comparable to that afforded to bank holding companies and shareholders thereof by section 10 of the Bank Holding Company Act. See 26 U.S.C. 1101-1103. The Board will consult with the Treasury Department with regard to this matter.

The letter of transmittal, presented by Mr. SPARKMAN, is as follows:

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD,

Washington, D.C., April 14, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft for a bill to amend section

408 of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The provisions of the draft are summarized and explained in an analysis which is transmitted herewith.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HORNE.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1967," the administration's amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

This bill, which in printed form will number 111 pages, contains a complete rewrite of titles I and II, the work training and community action titles of the present act. It contains many new legislative proposals; it consolidates and revises many of the amendments to the original Economic Opportunity Act which were adopted in 1965 and 1966; and it establishes in law many guidelines, regulations, and requirements in an effort to assure effective administration of economic opportunity programs.

Not having had a chance to study these proposed amendments in any detail, and because the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty is presently engaged in an intensive evaluation and examination of the war on poverty, I do not wish to prejudge the numerous and significant proposals contained in the bill.

I know that the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as well as all of my colleagues in the Senate will want to study this legislation carefully. As chairman of the Poverty Subcommittee I earnestly solicit the views of every Member of the Senate as the subcommittee progresses in its inquiry into the war on poverty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, together with a caption index to the amendments, a section-by-section analysis of the amendments, and a summary of the basis and the general content of the amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, index, analysis, and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1545) to provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operating, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1545

A bill to provide an improved charter for Economic Opportunity Act programs, to authorize funds for their continued operation, to expand summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act, may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$2,060,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$874,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title I of such Act, \$1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, \$47,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title III, \$70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, \$16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and \$31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"PART A—JOB CORPS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth standards and procedures for selecting individuals as enrollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of residential centers in which enrollees will participate in intensive programs of education, vocational training, work experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps. Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting distinct from their current environment, to become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of National, State, and community resources, and to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private institutions and agencies.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

"INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

"SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a young man or woman must be a person who—

"(1) is a permanent resident of the United States who has attained age sixteen but not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment;

"(2) is a low-income individual or member of a low-income family who requires additional education, training, or intensive counseling and related assistance in order to secure and hold meaningful employment, participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify for other training programs suitable

to his needs or satisfy Armed Forces requirements;

"(3) is currently living in an environment so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair his prospects for successful participation in any other program providing needed training, education, or assistance;

"(4) is determined, after careful screening as provided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure the full benefit of the program authorized in this part, and to be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern of work and training which that program involves;

"(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

"SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL PROVISION

"SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enrollment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these rules shall be implemented through arrangements which make use of public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for conducting screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accordingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with other individuals and organizations, including courts, probation and parole offices, law enforcement authorities, schools, welfare agencies, and medical agencies, and advisers. They shall also provide for—

"(1) an interview with each applicant for the purpose of—

"(A) determining whether his educational and vocational needs can best be met through the Job Corps or any alternative program in his home community;

"(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent data relating to his background, needs, and interests for evaluation in determining his eligibility and potential assignment; and

"(C) giving the applicant a full understanding of the Job Corps program and making clear what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the event of his acceptance.

"(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic inquiry concerning the applicant's background for the effective development and, as appropriate, clarification of information concerning his age, citizenship, school and draft status, health, employability, past behavior, family income, environment, and other matters related to a determination of his eligibility.

"(b) The Director shall make no payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.

"SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an enrollee unless it is determined that he can participate successfully in group situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or

be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to observe those rules. An individual shall be considered not to meet these requirements if he has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction or other major behavioral aberrations. The rules or regulations issued by the Director under this section shall specify, in detail, the actions or attributes which shall preclude selection, and those rules or regulations shall be binding upon all agencies authorized to screen or select persons for enrollment. The Director may authorize screening and selection agencies to refer to him cases where, notwithstanding the fact that the individual is not subject to specific disqualification set forth in those rules or regulations, they believe that there may be doubt as to whether he should be accepted; and cases where, notwithstanding a specific disqualification, they believe there may be unusual circumstances warranting an exception to permit selection. Exceptions, however, shall be granted by the Director only where he determines that selection would be fully consistent with the standards relating to the interests of other enrollees, the maintenance of discipline and satisfactory community relations, as set forth in this section.

"(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enrollment may be selected even though he is on probation or parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and all reports to State or other authorities that may be necessary to comply with applicable probation or parole requirements.

"(c) The Director shall maintain a continuing review of the criteria and procedures established under this part for the screening and selection of Job Corps applicants both with respect to their adequacy and the effectiveness with which they are applied, and he shall take such actions as may be necessary to assure that all agencies which are assigned screening and selection functions comply fully with those criteria and procedures.

"ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

"SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director may authorize in special cases.

"(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve any individual of obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

"(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 609(3) of this Act) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

"(d) Each enrollee shall be assigned to a center appropriate to his needs, as determined by the Director, which (taking into account current vacancies and requirements for the efficient program operation) is closest to the residence of such enrollee.

"(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those enrollees are assigned

to conservation centers, as described in section 107, or to other centers or projects where their work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, development, or management of public national resources or recreational areas and is performed under the direction of personnel of agencies regularly responsible for those functions.

"JOB CORPS CENTERS

"SEC. 107. The Director may make agreements with Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These centers shall be primarily residential in character and shall be designated and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training, work experience (either in direct program activities or through arrangements with employers), counseling and other services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall include conservation centers to be located primarily in rural areas and to provide, in addition to other training and assistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public recreational areas or to assist in developing community projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas and to provide activities which shall include training and other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected to participate successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semiskilled employment; and women's training centers, to be located in either urban or rural areas, and which shall provide education, training, and other activities appropriate to the special needs and potentialities of young women.

"PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps Center shall be operated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized and fully supervised program of education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required program for each enrollee shall include activities designed to assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with problems he may encounter in his home community or in adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-term upward mobility, and shall aggregate at least sixty hours a week. Center programs shall include required participation in center maintenance support and related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

"(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may arrange for enrollee education and vocational training through local public or private educational agencies, vocational educational institutions, or technical institutes where these institutions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could provide through other means.

"(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school; and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee's level of educational attainment.

"(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do not displace presently employed workers or impair existing contracts for service and will be coordinated with other work-experience programs in the community.

"ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

"SEC. 109. (a) The Director may provide enrollees with such personal travel and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, and other expenses as he may deem necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances shall be established at a rate not to exceed \$50 per month, except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Director; shall be graduated up to the maximum so as to encourage achievement and the best use by the enrollee of the funds so provided; and shall be subject to reduction in appropriate cases as a disciplinary measure. To the degree reasonable, enrollees shall be required to meet or contribute to costs associated with their individual comfort and enjoyment from their personal allowances.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules governing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed at least six months service in the Job Corps.

"(c) The Director may provide each former enrollee, upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the Job Corps. No enrollee shall be entitled to a readjustment allowance, however, unless he has remained in the program at least ninety days, except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Director. The Director may, from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems necessary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by that enrollee; and he may also, pursuant to rules or regulations, reduce the amount of an enrollee's readjustment allowance as a penalty for misconduct during participation in the Job Corps. In the event of an enrollee's death during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

"(4) Under such circumstances as the Director may determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director.

"STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

"SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

"(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulations set by the Director.

"COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

"SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall cooperate in activities designed to establish a mutually beneficial relationship between Job Corps centers and surrounding or nearby communities. These activities shall include the establishment of community advisory councils to provide a mech-

anism for joint discussion of common problems and for planning programs of mutual interest. Youth participation in advisory council affairs shall be encouraged and where feasible separate youth councils may be established, to be composed of representative enrollees and representative young people from the communities. The Director shall establish necessary rules and take necessary action to assure that each center is operated in a manner consistent with this section with a view to achieving, so far as possible, objectives which shall include: (1) giving community officials appropriate advance notice of changes in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect or be of interest to the community; (2) affording the community a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern to it, including policies governing the issuance and terms of passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full and rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies, including law enforcement agencies and agencies which work with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or projects for community improvement or betterment, with adequate advance consultation with business, labor, professional, and other interested community groups and organizations; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events in which enrollees and local residents may participate together; (6) providing community residents with opportunities to work with enrollees directly, as part-time instructors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center or in the community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8) promoting interchanges of information and techniques among, and cooperative projects involving, the center and community schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young people.

"PLACEMENT AND FOLLOWTHROUGH"

"Sec. 112. The Director shall provide or arrange for necessary services to assist enrollees to secure suitable employment or further training opportunities, to return to school or pursue their education, or undertake some other activity having a career potential. To the extent feasible, placement services shall be undertaken through or in cooperation with agencies or organizations, including the public employment service, which will be in a position to provide enrollees with reasonable followthrough necessary or appropriate to aid them in making a satisfactory initial adjustment with particular attention to those enrollees who in the course of completing their enrollment in a satisfactory manner have demonstrated the motivation to overcome special handicaps, or who face unusual adjustment problems, as in a new community.

"EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS"

"Sec. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program, with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as practicable, and providing information needed to assess the effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods of operation. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other Government and private agencies specific information concerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program.

"(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration projects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transportation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. Projects under this subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, including programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility and usefulness. He shall, either in his annual report or a separate annual document, report to the Congress concerning the actions taken under this section, including a full description of progress made in connection with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

"ADVISORY BOARDS AND COMMITTEES"

"Sec. 114. The Director shall make use of advisory committees or boards in connection with the operation of the Job Corps, and the operation of Job Corps centers, whenever he deems that the availability of outside advice and counsel on a regular basis would be of substantial benefit in identifying and overcoming problems, in planning program or center development, or in strengthening relationships between the Job Corps and agencies, institutions, or groups engaged in related activities. Nothing in this section shall be considered as limiting the functions of the National Advisory Council, established pursuant to section 605 of this Act, with respect to any matter or question involving the Job Corps; but this shall not prevent the establishment through or in cooperation with the National Advisory Council of one or more boards or committees under this section.

"PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES"

"Sec. 115. (a) The Director shall take necessary action to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of enrollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaningful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and coordination with State-operated programs.

"(b) The Director may enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

"(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days of such submission.

"APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW"

"Sec. 116. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those regarding hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits:

"(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed employees of the United States and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in the employ of the United States.

"(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be deemed civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 8101 of title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that subchapter shall apply except as follows:

"(A) The term 'performance of duty' shall not include any act or an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

"(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed that received under the entrance salary for a grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

"(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee is terminated.

"(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered employees of the Government.

"(d) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation or training center shall become the property of the United States.

"POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY"

"Sec. 118. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

"(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. Any officer,

employee, enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act.

"(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount of not exceeding \$500.

"(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

"SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"Sec. 117. (a) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase above forty-five thousand the enrollee capacity of Job Corps centers.

"(b) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of Job Corps enrollees in residence and receiving training, at least 25 per centum shall be women.

"(c) The Director shall take necessary action to insure that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$7,300 per enrollee.

"(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions."

WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part B of such title and amended to read as follows:

"PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"Sec. 102. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work-experience and work-training opportunities, together with related services and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed, underemployed, or other low-income and severely disadvantaged persons, both young and adult, to obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems, including programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in areas having high concentrations of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

"NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

"Sec. 121. The Director may provide financial assistance for—

"(1) programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades) and who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school; and

"(2) programs to provide unemployed individuals (aged sixteen through twenty-one years at the time of enrollment) with useful work experience and on-the-job training, combined where needed with educational

and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training, designed to assist those individuals to develop their maximum occupational potential.

"COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

"Sec. 122. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance for community employment and training projects. These projects shall provide work experience, on-the-job, or work training for unemployed, underemployed, or low-income persons (including projects involving both adults and youths age sixteen or over). They shall be designed to assist participants to secure or qualifying for—

"(1) permanent, meaningful employment without further assistance under this section, and

"(2) wherever possible, entry-level jobs involving the use or acquisition of skills needed for subprofessional or other career opportunities offering promise of regular or continued advancement.

"(b) Where feasible and consistent with the objectives of subsection (a), projects under this section shall be designed so that participants acquire work skills or experience in activities that involve, or will lead to permanent employment in, fields where there are critical or unmet community needs. These fields may include, without limitation, the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, public parks, highways, or other lands; neighborhood redevelopment; the provision of health, education, welfare, or public safety services; or other activities directed to bettering or beautifying a community or area or improving its physical, social, economic, or cultural condition.

"(c) Projects under this section shall include related supportive services, including basic education, occupational training, health services, and special counseling, as needed to assist participants to attain the objectives described in subsection (a).

"(d) In determining whether, in what amount and on what conditions, to assist projects or parts of projects otherwise eligible under this section, the Director shall consider—

"(1) in all cases, the degree to which efforts have been made to provide assurances of regular employment at the earliest feasible time, and the degree to which the project has been developed and realistically structured so as to take account of the desires, needs, and capabilities of participants;

"(2) in the case of projects or parts of projects involving activities related to physical improvements, whether the improvements will be substantially used by the low-income persons and families or will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in areas or neighborhoods having concentrations of low-income persons and families;

"(3) in the case of projects or parts of projects involving the development of entry-level employment opportunities, the extent to which the proposed activities will not only benefit those directly participating but will also contribute or give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs or providing job ladder opportunities, the development and recognition of new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons, or the elimination of artificial barriers in the community to employment and advancement on the part of those persons.

"SPECIAL URBAN EMPLOYMENT IMPACT PROGRAMS

"Sec. 123. (a) The Director may provide necessary financial assistance, as provided in this section, to meet costs of developing, planning, and carrying out projects which are designed to assist in meeting some of the critical problems facing urban areas, and to stimulate the fuller and more effective use of the resources which are or can

be made available in those areas to permit a substantial increase in employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

"(b) Projects under this section must—

"(1) be carried on in an urban area or neighborhood (defined without regard to political or other subdivision boundaries) having especially large concentrations of unemployed, underemployed, or low-income individuals, or be primarily designed to serve the needs of such individuals residing in such areas;

"(2) be supported by specific commitments of cooperation on the part of public and private employers in the community, including assurances that, to the maximum extent feasible, permanent employment opportunities have been or will be developed that are commensurate with the size, scope, schedule, and objectives of the program.

"(3) provide for the maximum feasible use of resources under other programs relating to the training of individuals to improve or restore their employability, including commitments of specific training opportunities under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962;

"(4) be appropriately focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended, so far as possible, to the most severely disadvantaged individuals who can reasonably be expected, given the other services or support available, to benefit from such training;

"(5) include or provide for expanded, more intensive, or improved supportive services not generally available, including day care for children, transportation, job orientation, health services, and intensive and continuing counseling, both before and after job placement, as necessary to assist participants to develop necessary job attitudes and the capability to secure, hold, and advance in regular competitive employment;

"(6) comply with other requirements prescribed by the Director to assure that programs are realistically structured to take account of the desires, needs and capabilities of participants; are directed so far as possible to specific, measurable goals and subject to adequate provisions for continuing local evaluation; are supported by assurances of needed cooperation from all relevant State or local governmental and private agencies; and will otherwise be administered and carried on in an efficient and effective manner.

"(c) In addition to necessary costs of developing or planning projects, financial assistance under this section may be used to meet—

"(1) costs of initiating or expanding projects or activities which are eligible for financial assistance under other sections of this part;

"(2) costs of expanding projects or activities under other programs related to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability;

"(3) costs of providing required supportive services not otherwise available; and

"(4) such other costs of administering, coordinating, or evaluating projects, including the provision of necessary related equipment or facilities, as may be specifically authorized in regulations of the Director.

"COORDINATION

"Sec. 124. Programs under this part shall be carried on with appropriate assistance from other Federal agencies having related responsibilities and shall be coordinated with other local and community programs, including maximum coordination with community action programs. They shall include necessary arrangements to best assure that individuals are recruited, referred, and provided with training, work experience, and other assistance in the manner that most accurately reflects each person's capacity to benefit from several programs authorized under this title and from other programs available to

him which provide services designed to enhance or restore employability.

"PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS: APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAWS

"SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be individuals who are permanent residents of the United States. For purposes of determining eligibility for participation in programs under this part, any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

"(b) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

"GENERAL CONDITIONS FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

"SEC. 126. The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant;

"(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 127. (a) The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under sections 121 and 122 among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.

"(b) Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not to exceed 25 per centum for the purpose of carrying out section 123; but not more than 12½ per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly, through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) such technical assistance or training for personnel as he determines is necessary to assist in the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part. He shall, in exercising this authority, give special consideration to the problems of rural areas, with a view to simplifying procedures and other technical requirements wherever feasible; developing model programs or projects; assisting rural areas to secure or better use resources under other programs relating to increasing or restoring employability and to combine those with projects or programs under this part; and generally assisting agencies in rural areas to develop and carry on the most effective programs consistent with local conditions.

"LIMITATIONS OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 129. (a) Federal financial assistance to any program or activity carried out pursuant to sections 121, 122, and 123 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the

cost of such program or activity, including costs of administration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

"(b) In the case of on-the-job training projects with other than public or private nonprofit organizations, the Director may authorize or enter into agreements to pay reasonable training costs, but not wages paid to participants for services performed.

"(c) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part are carried on subject to adequate internal controls, accounting requirements, and rules governing personnel standards and policies as may be necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency and the effective use of funds.

"(d) Financial assistance under this part shall be extended only to projects which are sponsored by public or private nonprofit agencies. The Director may, however, contract in special cases for the carrying out of projects or parts of projects by other private organizations where he finds such a contract to be justified on the basis of efficiency and economy and otherwise consistent with the provisions and purposes of this part.

"EVALUATION

"SEC. 130. The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs under this title, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals and their impact on other related programs. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of those programs or individual projects."

COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

SEC. 103. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 201. This title provides for community action agencies and programs, prescribes the structure and describes the functions of community action agencies, and authorizes financial assistance to community action programs and related projects and activities. Its basic purpose is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, State, private, and Federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families, and low-income individuals of all ages, in rural and urban areas, to attain the skills, knowledge, and motivations and secure the opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient. Its specific purposes are to promote, as methods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of individual and family self-sufficiency—

"(1) the strengthening of community capabilities for planning and coordinating Federal, State, and other assistance related to the elimination of poverty, so that this assistance through the efforts of local officials organizations and interested and affected citizens can be made more responsible to local needs and conditions;

"(2) the better organization of a range of services related to the needs of the poor, so that these services may be made more effective and efficient in helping families and individuals to overcome particular problems in a way that takes account of, and supports their progress in overcoming, related problems;

"(3) the greater use, subject to adequate evaluation, of new types of services and innovative approaches in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increasingly effective methods of employing available resources;

"(4) the development and implementation of all programs and projects designed to serve the poor or low-income areas with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served, so as to best stimulate and take full advantage of capabilities for self-advancement and assure that those programs and projects are otherwise meaningful to and widely utilized by their intended beneficiaries; and

"(5) the broadening of the resource base of programs directed to the elimination of poverty, so as to secure, in addition to the services and assistance of public officials, private religious, charitable, and neighborhood organizations, and individual citizens, a more active role for business, labor, and professional groups able to provide employment opportunities or otherwise influence the quantity and quality of services of concern to the poor.

"PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

"ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES; COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 210. (a) The Director shall encourage communities to establish public or private nonprofit agencies, to be known as community action agencies. A community action agency shall be responsible for, and must be capable of, planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a program, to be known as a community action program. A community action program is a community based and operated program—

"(1) which includes or is designed to include a sufficient number of projects or components to provide, in sum, a range of services and activities having a measurable and potentially major impact on causes of poverty in the community or those areas of the community where poverty is a particularly acute problem;

"(2) which has been developed, and which organizes and combines its component projects and activities, in a manner appropriate to carry out all the purposes of this title; and

"(3) which conforms to such other supplementary criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions of this title.

"(b) Components of a community action program may be administered by the community action agency, where consistent with sound and efficient management and applicable law, or by other agencies. They may be projects eligible for assistance under this title, or projects assisted from other public or private sources; and they may be either specially designed to meet local needs, or designed pursuant to the eligibility standards of a State or Federal program providing assistance to a particular kind of activity which will help in meeting those needs.

"(c) The community in which a community action agency is established to carry on a community action program may be a city, county, multicounty, multicounty, or other governmental unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (whether or not its boundaries correspond with those of any political subdivision); but it must in any event provide the organizational base and possess the commonality of interest needed for an efficient and effective program conforming to the requirements of this section.

"STRUCTURE OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

"SEC. 211. (a) Each community action agency shall be established and constructed so as to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program as developed and implemented is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board organized to provide for membership of the chief elected

official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials, or their representatives, of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community. At least one-third of the membership of the board shall be persons chosen in accordance with democratic selection procedures adequate to assure that they are representative of the poor in the community. All members of the governing board selected to represent specific geographic areas within a community must reside in the areas they represent. Each community action agency shall establish procedures by which community agencies and representative groups of the poor, including but not limited to minority groups, the elderly and (where applicable) rural residents, which feel themselves inadequately represented may petition for the representation they consider appropriate.

"(b) The powers of every community action agency governing board shall include the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, to determine major personnel, fiscal, and program policies, to approve overall program plans and priorities, and to assure compliance with conditions of and approve proposals for financial assistance under this title.

"SPECIFIC POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

"SEC. 212. (a) In order to carry out its overall responsibility for planning, coordinating, evaluating, and administering a community action program, a community action agency must have authority under its charter or applicable law to receive and administer funds under this title, funds and contributions from private or local public sources which may be used in support of a community action program, and funds under any Federal or State assistance program pursuant to which a public or private nonprofit agency (as the case may be) organized in accordance with this part could act as grantee, contractor, or sponsor of projects appropriate for inclusion in a community action program. A community action agency must also be empowered to transfer funds so received, and to delegate powers to other agencies, subject to the powers of its governing board and its overall program responsibilities. This power to transfer funds and delegate powers must include the power to make transfers and delegations covering component projects in all cases where this will contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise further program objectives.

"(b) In exercising its powers and carrying out its overall responsibility for a community action program, a community action agency shall have, subject to the purposes of this title, at least the following functions:

"(1) Planning systematically for and evaluating the program, including actions to develop information as to the problems and causes of poverty in the community, determine how much and how effectively assistance is being provided to deal with those problems and causes, and establish priorities among projects, activities and areas as needed for the best and most efficient use of resources.

"(2) Encouraging agencies engaged in activities related to the community action program to plan for, secure and administer assistance available under this title or from other sources on a common or cooperative basis; providing planning or technical assistance to those agencies; and generally, in cooperation with community agencies and officials, undertaking actions to improve existing efforts to attack poverty, such as improving day-to-day communication, closing service gaps, focusing resources on the most needy, and providing additional opportunities to low-income individuals for regular employ-

ment or participation in the programs or activities for which those community agencies and officials are responsible.

"(3) Initiating and sponsoring projects responsive to needs of the poor which are not otherwise being met, with particular emphasis on providing central or common services that can be drawn upon by a variety of related programs, developing new approaches or new types of services that can be incorporated into other programs, and filling gaps pending the expansion or modification of those programs.

"(4) Establishing effective procedures by which the poor and area residents concerned will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests, providing for their regular participation in the implementation of those programs, and providing technical and other support needed to enable the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources.

"(5) Joining with and encouraging business, labor, and other private groups and organizations to undertake, together with public officials and agencies, activities in support of the community action program which will result in the additional use of private resources and capabilities, with a view to such things as developing new employment opportunities, stimulating investment that will have a measurable impact in reducing poverty among residents of areas of concentrated poverty, and providing methods by which residents of those areas can work with private groups, firms, and institutions in seeking solutions to problems of common concern.

"STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 213. A State or regional agency may be a community action agency for the purposes of programs in a number of rural areas or smaller communities if the Director determines that the agency is structured and capable of operating in a manner consistent with the purposes of this part, including the participation and representation requirements of section 211(a), and that the operation of a State or regional program in the areas or communities concerned is justified on the basis of efficiency and effectiveness.

"ADMINISTRATIVE STANDARDS

"SEC. 214. (a) Each community action agency shall observe, and shall (as appropriate) require or encourage other agencies participating in a community action program to observe, standards of organization, management and administration which will assure, so far as reasonably possible, that all program activities are conducted in a manner consistent with the purposes of this title and the objective of providing assistance effectively, efficiently and free of any taint of partisan political bias or personal or family favoritism. Each community action agency shall establish or adopt rules to carry out this section, which shall include rules to assure full staff accountability in matters governed by law, regulations, or agency policy. Each community action agency shall also provide for reasonable public access to information, including but not limited to public hearings at the request of appropriate community groups and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or other agencies engaged in program activities or operations involving the use of authority or funds for which it is responsible. And each community action agency shall adopt for itself and other agencies using funds or exercising authority for which it is responsible rules designed to establish specific standards governing salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances, and other employee benefits; to assure that only persons capable of discharging their duties with competence and integrity are employed and that employees are promoted or advanced under impartial procedures calculated to im-

prove agency performance and effectiveness; to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interests; and to define employee duties of advocacy on behalf of the poor in an appropriate manner which will in any case preclude employees from participating, in connection with the performance of their duties, in any form of picketing, protest, or other direct action which is in violation of law.

"(b) The Director shall prescribe rules or regulations to supplement subsection (a), which shall include regulations governing matters relating to partisan political activities and elections referred to in section 603 (b) of this Act, and which shall be binding on all agencies carrying on community action program activities with financial assistance under this title. He may, where appropriate, establish special simplified requirements for smaller agencies or agencies operating in rural areas. These special requirements shall not, however, affect the applicability of rules governing conflicts of interest, use of position or authority for partisan political purposes or participation in direct action, regardless of customary practices or rules among agencies in the community. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs providing assistance to activities which may be included in community action programs for the purpose of securing maximum consistency between rules or regulations prescribed or followed by those agencies and those prescribed under this section.

"EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

"SEC. 215. (a) In determining whether, in which amount, and on what conditions, to extend financial assistance to a new community action program, the Director shall consider evidence of the extent of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to undertake an efficient and effective program in full conformity to the purposes of this title. In renewing or supplementing that financial assistance, he shall consider the progress made in carrying on such a program, consistent with needs and with due allowance for the special problems of rural and smaller communities, and the efficiency with which the agency has discharged its specific functions and duties to this end. The Director shall prescribe standards for evaluation of overall effectiveness and specific agency operations in accordance with this subsection. In developing those standards he shall consider, but not be limited to, the use of criteria covering: the number and incomes of persons or families served and seeking to be served and the length of their participation; the extent to which those persons and families have been aided in establishing specific goals and have in fact attained those goals; the extent to which resources have been committed which are over and above the contributions required by this title; the degree to which full use has been made of sources of financial assistance other than this title; the degree to which agencies, groups, and organizations, including the poor and area representatives, have actively participated in the formulation and implementation of the program in question; the extent and effectiveness of follow-through arrangements among agencies operating different components and related agencies in the community; and the extent to which activities of approaches initiated as part of the program have been incorporated in other ongoing programs in the community.

"(b) In addition to evaluations undertaken directly by him or by community action agencies, the Director may provide for, or require community action agencies to provide for, independent evaluations. Where appropriate, he may also require a community action agency to establish an independ-

ent group or committee to provide evaluation and advisory services on either a short-term or continuing basis.

"PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

"DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 220. The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies to assist them in developing community action programs in accordance with this title. He may also provide financial assistance to other public or private nonprofit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency or participation in a community action program, including assistance to local governments in connection with planning activities and organizational changes to support or improve the effectiveness of such programs.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

"SEC. 221. (a) In order to aid in the implementation of community action programs, the Director may provide general financial assistance to those programs in accordance with the provisions of this section. This assistance may be used, as approved by the Director, by community action agencies in order to enable them to carry out their planning, coordination, evaluation, and overall administration responsibilities as described in part A of this title. It may also be used for the development and operation of approved program components which are necessary for a fully effective program and for which assistance is not available, as needed, from other sources. These component projects may involve, without limitation, activities providing services, together with necessary related facilities, designed to assist families and individuals to secure and retain meaningful employment; to make better use of available income in connection with efforts for self-advancement; to attain basic educational skills needed for employment, family self-help, or successful participation in school; to better secure, use, and maintain housing required for a suitable living environment; to undertake family planning consistent with personal and family goals, religious and moral convictions; and to make more frequent and effective use of programs available to help in overcoming specific problems. Components providing these or other services may be focused upon the needs of specific low-income groups, such as the very young, youth, the elderly, the unemployed, and persons receiving public assistance, but shall wherever feasible be structured so as to foster family participation and progress.

"(b) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public or private nonprofit agency other than a community action agency for activities of the kind described in subsection (a) where he determines, after receiving and considering comments of the community action agency, if any, that there is good cause for the granting of such assistance and that such action would be in furtherance of the policies applicable to this title.

"(c) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules or regulations governing applications for assistance under this section to assure that every reasonable effort is made by each applicant to secure the views of local public officials and agencies in the community having a direct or substantial interest in the application and to resolve all issues of cooperation and possible duplication prior to its submission.

"SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 222. (a) In order to stimulate actions to meet or deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor which are common to a number of communities, the Director may develop and carry on special

programs under this section. This authority shall be used only where the Director determines that the objectives sought could not be effectively achieved through the use of authorities under sections 220 and 221, including assistance to components or projects based on models developed and promulgated by him. It shall also be used only with respect to programs which (1) involve activities which can be incorporated into or be closely coordinated with community action programs, (2) involve significant new combinations of resources or new and innovative approaches, and (3) are structured in a way that will, within the limits of the type of assistance or activities contemplated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of this title. Subject to such conditions as may be appropriate to assure effective and efficient administration, the Director may provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to carry on local projects initiated under such special programs; but he shall do so in a manner that will encourage, wherever feasible, the inclusion of the assisted projects in community action programs, with a view to minimizing possible duplication and promoting efficiencies in the use of common facilities and services, better assisting persons or families having a variety of needs, and otherwise securing from the funds committed the greatest possible impact in promoting family and individual self-sufficiency. Programs under this section shall include those described in the following paragraphs:

"(1) A program to be known as 'Project Headstart' focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance which will provide such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services, as the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full potential, together with appropriate activities to encourage the participation of parents of such children and permit the effective use of parent services.

"(2) A 'legal services program' to provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information, as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, in furtherance of the cause for justice among persons living in poverty. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed project for legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the proposal before it is approved or funded.

"(3) A 'comprehensive health services program' to aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health services projects focused upon the needs of urban and rural areas having high concentrations of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

"(A) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, including but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and follow-up services, together with necessary related facilities and services; and

"(B) to assure that these services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are combined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, edu-

cation, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.

Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary to pay the full costs of projects. Before approving any project, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing related services are furnished all assistance needed to permit them to plan for participation in the program and for the necessary continuation of those related services.

"(4) A program to be known as 'Upward Bound' designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher education and one or more secondary schools. They must include a curriculum designed to develop the critical thinking, effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for postsecondary education success, necessary health services and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the Director determines may be appropriate.

"(b) In developing programs under subsection (a), the Director shall give priority to programs involving services or activities whose effectiveness has been tested in one or more community action programs, or in connection with other Federal, State, or local programs, public or private. The Director shall also cooperate with Federal and State agencies with a view to developing, pursuant to subsection (a), programs which will supplement or improve programs for which those agencies are responsible. Where appropriate, he shall provide for the operation of programs under subsection (a) by other Federal or State agencies, pursuant to delegations of authority or suitable agreements.

"(c) Programs under subsection (a) may include essential training, research, and technical assistance directly related to program development and implementation, and funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to training, research, and technical assistance activities.

"(d) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of all programs under this section, including their impact in terms of the needs or problems at which they are directed, and their relationship to and effect upon related programs. For this purpose, he shall consult with other Federal agencies, or where appropriate with State agencies, in order to provide wherever feasible for jointly sponsored objective evaluation studies on a National or State basis. The reports of such studies, together with the comments of the Director and other agencies, if any, thereon, shall be public records and shall be reflected in the annual report of the Director.

"ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 223. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or allocated for assistance in the development and implementation of community action programs pursuant to sections 220 and 221, and for special program projects referred to in section 222(a), and which are not subject to any other provision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also re-

serve not more than 20 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That part of any State's allotment which the Director determines will not be needed may be reallocated, at such dates during the fiscal year as the Director may fix, in proportion to the original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States.

"(b) The Director may provide for the separate allotment of funds for any special program referred to in section 222(a). This allotment may be made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made in accordance with other criteria which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the needs or problems at which the program is directed, except that in no event may more than 12½ per centum of the funds for any one program be used in any one State.

"(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial assistance extended to a community action agency or other agency pursuant to sections 220, 221, and 222(a), for the period ending June 30, 1967, shall not exceed 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or activities, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of such percentages if he determines, in accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria, that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, or services.

"(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under sections 220, 221, and 222(a) unless the Director satisfies himself (1) that the services to be provided under such program will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services previously provided without Federal assistance, and (2) that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not be diminished in order to provide any contributions required under subsection (c) or otherwise qualify for assistance under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a strict application of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

"PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

"SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering programs under this title, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel which is needed in connection with those programs or which otherwise pertains to the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial assistance under this title, the Director may make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise it in the performance of

functions related to the assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

"STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to State agencies designated in accordance with State law, to enable those agencies—

"(1) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title;

"(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title;

"(3) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies in programs under this title; and

"(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 631 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede State level coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

"(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the agencies designated pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

"RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 232. (a) The Director may contract or provide financial assistance for pilot or demonstration projects conducted by public or private agencies which are designed to test or assist in the development of new approaches or methods that will aid in overcoming special problems or otherwise in furthering the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Director shall establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects and determining whether the findings resulting from any research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate annual report, the Director shall submit a description for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived from those activities, together with a statement indicating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be realized.

"(c) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be used for the purposes of subsection (a).

"PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

"RURAL AREAS

"SEC. 240. (a) In exercising authority under this title, the Director shall take necessary steps to further the extension of benefits to residents of rural areas, consistent with the extent and severity of poverty among rural residents, and to encourage high levels of managerial and technical competence in programs undertaken in rural areas. These steps shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, (1) the development under section 222(a) of programs particularly respon-

sive to special needs of rural areas; (2) the establishment, pursuant to section 232(a), of a program of research and pilot project activities specifically focused upon the problems of rural poverty; (3) the provision of technical assistance so as to afford a priority to agencies in rural communities and to aid those agencies, through such arrangements as may be appropriate, in securing assistance under Federal programs which are related to this title but which are not generally utilized in rural areas; and (4) the development of special or simplified procedures, forms, guidelines, model components, and model programs for use in rural areas.

"(b) In order to further implement the policy described in subsection (a), the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing those criteria, he shall consider the relative numbers in the States or areas therein of (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-grade education; and (6) persons rejected for military service.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Director is authorized to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private nonprofit agencies for any project for which assistance to community action agencies is authorized, if he determines that it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time. The assistance so granted shall be subject to such conditions as the Director deems appropriate to promote adherence to the purposes of this title and the early establishment of a community action agency in the area.

"(d) The Director shall encourage the development of programs for the interchange of personnel, for the undertaking of common or related projects, and other methods of cooperation between urban and rural communities, with particular emphasis on fostering cooperation in situations where it may contribute to new employment opportunities, and between larger urban communities with concentrations of low-income persons and families and rural areas in which substantial numbers of those persons and families have recently resided.

"COORDINATION—FEDERAL AGENCIES; USE OF STATE FUNDS

"SEC. 241. (a) The heads of all Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Director in carrying out his responsibilities under this title and shall, to the extent permitted by law, exercise their powers so as to encourage implementation of the purposes of this title with respect to all programs appropriate for inclusion in community action programs. The Director may call upon other Federal agencies for advice, information, or assistance, including the establishment of working groups of Federal personnel, in dealing with specific problems of coordination arising under programs authorized in this title. Cooperative actions or undertakings initiated pursuant to this subsection may include evaluation of local programs on a common or joint basis, and actions to assist particular communities in overcoming problems arising out of diverse Federal requirements, or in developing long-range plans where justified by prior progress.

"(b) Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to a community action agency or other agency assisted under this title, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement may be established according to the

proportion of funds advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

"(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of the United States for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or programs involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this title.

"SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

"SEC. 242. In carrying out the provisions of this title, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this part. This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

"FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND AUDIT

"SEC. 243. (a) No funds shall be released to any agency receiving financial assistance under this title until it has submitted to the Director a statement certifying that the assisted agency and its delegate agencies (or subcontractors for performance of any major portion of the assisted program) have established an accounting system with internal controls adequate to safeguard their assets, check the accuracy and reliability of the accounting data, promote operating efficiency and encourage compliance with prescribed management policies and such additional fiscal responsibility and accounting requirements as the Director may establish. The statement may be furnished by a certified public accountant, a duly licensed public accountant or, in the case of a public agency, the appropriate public financial officer who accepts responsibility for providing required financial services to that agency.

"(b) Within three months after the effective date of a grant to or contract of assistance with an organization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy of the accounting system and internal controls established thereunder to meet the standards set forth in the statement referred to in paragraph (a). Promptly after the completion of the survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of findings and conclusions resulting from the survey whether the accounting systems and internal controls meet those standards and, if not, whether to suspend the grant or contract. In the event of suspension, the assisted agency shall be given not more than six months within which to establish the necessary systems and controls, and, in the event of failure to do so within such time period, the assistance shall be terminated by the Director.

"(c) At least once annually the Director shall make or cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such audit, he shall determine on the basis

of resulting findings and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve months after the date of disallowance.

"(d) The Director shall establish such other requirements and take such actions as he may deem necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section and to insure fiscal responsibility and accountability, and the effective and efficient handling of funds in connection with programs assisted under this title. These requirements and actions shall include (1) necessary action to assure that the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial assistance does not exceed the rate contemplated under its approved program; and (2) appropriate requirements to promote the continuity and coordination of all projects or components of community action programs receiving financial assistance under this title, including provision for the periodic reprogramming and supplementation of assistance previously provided.

"SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 244. The following special limitations shall apply, as indicated, to programs under this title.

"(1) Financial assistance under this title may include funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attendance at meetings of any community action agency governing board, neighborhood council or committee, as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum feasible participation of members of groups and residents of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses connected with those meetings; but those funds (or matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allowances in the case of any individual who is a Federal, State, or local government employee, or an employee of a community action agency, or for payment of an allowance to any individual for attendance at more than two meetings a month.

"(2) The Director shall issue necessary rules or regulations to assure that no employee engaged in carrying out community action program activities receiving financial assistance under this title is compensated from funds so provided at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum, and that any amount paid to such an employee at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether the non-Federal contributions requirements of section 223 have been complied with; the Director may, however, provide in those rules or regulations for exceptions covering cases where, because of the need for specialized or professional skills or prevailing local wage levels, application of the foregoing restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

"(3) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board, council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee, contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a program receiving financial assistance under this title; but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serving on a board, council, or committee which does not have any authority or powers in connection with a program assisted under this title.

"(4) In granting financial assistance for projects or activities in the field of family planning, the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made

available to all low income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this part which have been established by the assisted agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in connection with any such financial assistance, that—

"(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

"(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

The use of family planning services assisted under this title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

"(5) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system; but this shall not prohibit the provision of special, remedial, and other noncurricular assistance.

"(6) In extending assistance under this title the Director shall give special consideration to programs which make maximum use of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

"DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 245. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

SEC. 104. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately under the title heading a new part heading to read "PART A—RURAL LOANS PROGRAM", and (2) striking out the heading immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof a new heading to read "LOANS TO FAMILIES".

(b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards."

(c) Section 302(a) of such Act is amended by inserting the word "principal" after the word "aggregate".

(d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as section 306, and amended by striking out "titles III of this Act" in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "this part".

(e) Part B of title III of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEASONALLY EMPLOYED, FARMWORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly complex and technological society.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 312. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions and cooperatives in developing and carrying out programs to fulfill the purpose of this part.

"(b) Programs assisted under this part may include projects or activities—

"(1) to meet the immediate needs of of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and

their families, such as day care for children, education, health services, improved housing and sanitation, legal advice and representation, and consumer training and counseling:

"(2) to promote increased community acceptance of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families; and

"(3) to equip unskilled migrant and seasonal farmworkers through education and training to meet the changing demands in agricultural employment brought about by technological advancement and to take advantage of opportunities available to improve their well-being and self-sufficiency by gaining regular or permanent employment or by participating in available Government training programs.

"LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 313. (a) Assistance shall not be extended under this part unless the Director determines that the applicant will maintain its prior level of effort in similar activities.

"(b) The Director shall establish necessary procedures or requirements to assure that programs under this part are carried on in coordination with other programs or activities providing assistance to the persons and groups served.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION

"SEC. 314. (a) The Director may provide directly or through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, such technical assistance or training of personnel as may be required to implement effectively the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Director shall provide for necessary evaluation of projects under this title and may, through grants or contracts, secure independent evaluation for this purpose."

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

SEC. 105. (a) Section 601(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "four" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "six".

(b) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

"(1) the term 'State' means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning of 'State' shall also include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 223 of this Act this term means only a State or the District of Columbia. The term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes all those places named in the previous sentence, and all other places continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

"(2) the term 'financial assistance' when used in titles I, II, and III-B includes assistance advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services; and

"(3) the term 'permanent resident of the United States' when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of sections 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, or any person admitted as a conditional entrant under section 203(a)(7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

(c) Section 610-1(a) of such Act is amended by inserting the words "a substantial number of the" immediately before the word "persons" the second and third time that word appears.

(d) Section 616 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"TRANSFER OF FUNDS

"SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appropriations for any program or activity under this Act or any Act authorizing appropriations for such program or activity, not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling the Director to carry out any such program or activity under the Act may be transferred and used by the Director for the purpose of carrying out any other such program or activity under the Act; but no such transfer shall result in increasing the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity by more than 10 per centum."

(e) Title VI of such Act is amended by—

(1) striking out section 604;

(2) striking out the heading "PART B—COORDINATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS" and sections 611, 612, 613, and 614; and

(3) inserting at the end thereof a new part B to read as follows:

"PART B—COORDINATION

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 630. This part establishes an Economic Opportunity Council, provides for an information center, and prescribes certain duties and responsibilities. Its purpose is to promote better coordination among all programs related to this Act, with a view to making those programs more effective in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State and local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to varying local problems and conditions, stimulating new and more imaginative ways of combining complementary Federal resources in the solution of specific problems, and generally improving cooperation and communication among all levels of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related to the purposes of this Act.

"ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

"SEC. 631. (a) There is established an Economic Opportunity Council. The Council shall include the Director who shall be Chairman, the Attorney General, the Secretaries of Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Director of Selective Service. The President, in his discretion, may from time to time revise the membership of the Council to take account of changes in functions or otherwise assure representation on the Council that will best promote the purposes of this part. Each member shall designate an alternative to sit in his stead in the event of his unavoidable absence.

"(b) It shall be the responsibility of the Council to consult with and advise the President and the Director in carrying out their functions, including the coordination of antipoverty efforts by all segments of the government. In doing so, the Council shall—

"(1) advise generally on the coordination of Federal programs related to this Act;

"(2) review and make recommendations, as appropriate, with respect to major policy issues and questions of basic priorities involving the coordination of programs related to this Act;

"(3) initiate, consider, recommend, and, to the extent feasible, arrange for the carrying out of specific actions or projects designed to improve coordination among programs related to this Act; and

"(4) provide general guidance and advice in connection with the operation of the information center provided for in this part and assist the Director in making the center more effective.

"(c) The Council may be provided a staff

by the Director. Employees of other executive departments and agencies may be detailed to the Council from time to time for temporary assistance.

"(d) As directed by the President, or from time to time as it deems appropriate, the Council shall report to the President concerning specific actions which it has taken, or proposes to take, in carrying out its responsibilities. To the extent appropriate, a report of the Council's activities shall be reflected in the Director's annual report to the President and the Congress or in a separate report to the President for transmittal to the Congress.

"RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

"SEC. 632. In addition to his other powers under this Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the antipoverty efforts of all Federal agencies, the Director shall—

"(1) undertake special studies of specific coordination problems at the request of the President or the Council, or on his own initiative; and

"(2) carry on a continuing evaluation of all activities under this Act, and consult with interested agencies and groups, including State agencies described in section 231 of this Act and the National Advisory Council, with a view to identifying coordination problems may warrant consideration by the Council or the President and, to the extent feasible or appropriate, initiate action for overcoming those problems, either through the Office of Economic Opportunity or in conjunction with other Federal, State, or local agencies.

"COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

"SEC. 633. (a) Federal agencies administering programs related to this Act shall—

"(1) cooperate with the Director and with the Council in carrying out their duties and responsibilities; and

"(2) carry out their programs and exercise their functions so as to assist in carrying out the provisions and purposes of this Act, to the fullest extent permitted by other applicable law.

"(b) The Council and the Director may call upon Federal agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and other materials as they deem necessary to discharge their responsibilities under this Act.

"(c) The President may direct that particular programs and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of Federal agencies shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support of programs authorized under this Act.

"COMBINATIONS AMONG PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

"SEC. 634. In order to encourage efficiencies, close unnecessary service gaps, and generally promote more effective administration, the Director shall require, to the fullest extent feasible, that projects or programs assisted under this Act be carried on so as to supplement one another, or where appropriate other related programs or projects, and be included within or otherwise carried on in combination with community action programs. In the case of other programs related to this Act, the heads of the Federal agencies responsible for those programs shall, to the extent permitted by law, similarly provide assistance for projects and activities in a manner which encourages combinations with other related projects and activities, where appropriate, and with community action programs. The Economic Opportunity Council shall, in carrying out its responsibilities under this part, make a continuing review of the operation of this section with a view to (1) determining particular groups of programs which, because of their objectives, or similarities in target groups or areas, are especially appropriate for combined or closely coordinated operation at the State or local level, and making recommendations

accordingly to the President or appropriate Federal officials; (2) evaluating Federal agency procedures for carrying out this section, and developing or recommending additional or common procedures, as appropriate; and (3) determining whether, and to what extent, consolidations of Federal programs may be justified and making recommendations respecting such consolidations to the Director and the President.

"INFORMATION CENTER"

"SEC. 635. (a) The Director shall establish and operate an information center for the purpose of insuring that maximum use is made of Federal programs related to this Act and that information concerning those programs and other relevant information is readily available to public officials and other interested persons. The Director shall collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute information as described above, either free of charge or by sale at cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's account as an offset of that cost), and may make arrangements and pay for any printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulations. In connection with operation of the center, the Director may carry on research or studies concerning the improvement of information systems in support of the purposes of this Act, the adequacy of existing data, ways in which data generated on the State and local level may be incorporated into Federal information systems, and methods by which data may be made more readily available to State and local officials or used to further coordination objectives.

"(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement. He may also make grants, from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this Act, to States and communities to establish information service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribution of information required to further the purposes of this Act.

"(c) In order to assure that all appropriate officials are kept fully informed of programs related to this Act, and that maximum use is made of those programs, the Director shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to State and local agencies of all current information, including administrative rules, regulations, and guidelines, required by those agencies for the effective performance of their responsibilities.

"PROHIBITION"

"SEC. 636. In order to assure that existing Federal agencies are used to the fullest extent possible in carrying out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry out this Act shall be used to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

"SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: TRAINING PROGRAMS"

"SEC. 637. (a) It shall be the responsibility of the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other departments and agencies concerned, acting through such procedures or mechanisms as the President may prescribe, to provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all programs and activities within the executive branch of the Government relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate (which may include arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

"(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides and develops its capacity for providing maxi-

mum support for the programs described in subsection (a); and

"(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program, such employment information as will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained.

"DEFINITIONS"

"SEC. 638. As used in this part, 'programs related to this Act' and 'coordination' shall include the programs and actions described in this section:

"(1) 'Programs related to this Act' include programs under this Act and all Federal or federally assisted programs which have objectives which are, in whole or substantial part, complementary to the purposes of this Act, or which provide resources which may be used in combination with resources under this Act to assist in achieving any of the purposes of this Act.

"(2) 'Coordination' includes, but is not limited to—

"(A) actions to improve the common effectiveness of programs in reaching and serving the poor, such as actions: to extend services to new areas, provide them in a common place, or structure them so that they are more readily accepted or widely utilized; to eliminate procedures or requirements that may be inappropriate for or result in unnecessary hardship to disadvantaged persons with limited education or other special handicaps; to establish common eligibility standards among programs serving substantially similar groups or operating in the same areas; or to develop methods of operation or administration that will provide new employment incentives or opportunities for the poor;

"(B) actions to promote better use at the State or local level of Federal assistance available under diverse programs, such as actions to establish procedures for cooperation among State or local agencies seeking assistance from different Federal sources with a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication and service gaps and promoting common or complementary priorities; or to modify or improve technical or administrative requirements imposed by different Federal agencies that may operate to increase unnecessarily the burdens of State or local agencies, minimize their opportunities for the imaginative use of Federal assistance, or discourage their cooperation with one another;

"(C) actions to promote simplification and efficiencies through the joint or combined use of Federal resources, such as actions to develop new methods of processing requests for assistance or granting assistance that will enable Federal agencies more generally to use resources jointly in support of common objectives; to establish common priorities for purposes of program planning, research and demonstration activities; and to effect combinations among or redirect Federal programs or activities for the purpose of eliminating unnecessary duplication;

"(D) actions to improve communication and general cooperation, such as actions to strengthen ties among regional offices of different Federal agencies and among such offices and other regional agencies or organizations; to develop and improve procedures by which Federal agencies may act together in promulgating or making available items of information, including information as to the availability and allocation of funds, which are closely related to one another for purposes of State or local planning and budgeting; or to develop procedures by which State and local agencies may be afforded new opportunities to participate in Federal policy decisions, including decisions on recommended legislation, affecting their capacity to operate efficiently and effectively."

AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

SEC. 106. (a) Title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES"

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE"

"SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to provide incentives to welfare recipients to participate in programs under this Act which are designed to enable them to become self-supporting, and to complete such programs and become self-supporting within a reasonable period of time.

"STATE PLANS"

"SEC. 702. Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall include provisions consistent with the rules prescribed or under this title.

"DEFINITIONS"

"SEC. 703. For the purposes of this title—

"(a) 'Public assistance' shall mean any aid or assistance payable pursuant to a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

"(b) 'Trainee' shall mean any person enrolled in any program under title I, II, or III-B of this Act or employed in any such program as a resident nonprofessional or in any other combined work-and-training capacity.

"(c) 'Qualifying income' shall mean (1) any amount paid as wages under title I of this Act to a trainee in a program described in paragraph (1) of section 121 of the Act (relating to Neighborhood Youth Corps programs for youth attending school); (2) any amount paid under this Act as wages, training allowance, or stipend to any other trainee during his first eighteen months as such a trainee; and (3) the net income derived, during the first eighteen months following initial receipt of assistance under title III-A of this Act, by any assisted family from the assisted farm or nonagricultural enterprise.

"(d) 'Poverty line' shall mean an amount of monthly income determined by the Director, representing an approximation of the minimum level of income which is necessary to support a family of given size so that it can live out of poverty.

"ATTRIBUTION OF INCOME"

"SEC. 704. Unless otherwise provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, no payment made under this Act to or on behalf of any trainee shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX except to the extent that the payment is made available to or used for the benefit of such other individual.

"AMOUNT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE"

"SEC. 705. (a) The amount of public assistance payable for any month to any person having qualifying income shall be the higher of (1) the amount determined under the State plan without regard to this section, or (2) the amount determined under subsection (b).

"(b) The amount of public assistance which is payable for any month to any person who receives qualifying income shall be computed, for purposes of this subsection, as follows:

"(1) The amount of public assistance, excluding assistance for medical care, shall be computed under the State plan as if the qualifying income had not been received (and without any provision for expenses connected with earning the qualifying income).

"(2) The qualifying income for the month shall be converted into a percentage of the monthly poverty line.

"(3) The amount of public assistance payable (other than assistance for medical care) shall be the amount determined under clause

(1) above, reduced by the percentage determined under clause (2) or, if the State plan so provides by eight-tenths of that percentage.

"(4) Assistance for medical care shall be provided in accordance with the State plan. In States where the plan provides that assistance for medical care depends upon eligibility for other public assistance, such eligibility shall be determined in accordance with this subsection.

"(c) If more than one member of a family receives qualifying income, the qualifying income of all members of the family shall be aggregated in determining the percentage referred to in subsection (b)(2). The foregoing sentence shall not apply in cases in which its application would be inconsistent with section 704.

"SAVINGS PROVISION

"SEC. 706. If, at the time the rules prescribed in section 705 become effective in his State, a trainee's public assistance is being computed in accordance with the prior version of this title, it shall continue to be so computed until (1) his rights under the prior version expire, or (2) he completes his participation in the particular program in which he is a trainee, whichever occurs sooner. Thereafter, if he receives additional qualifying income, his public assistance shall be determined in accordance with section 705."

(b) In the case of any State whose State plan meets the requirements of section 701 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in effect prior to the amendment made by subsection (2) of this section, no funds to which the State is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act shall be withheld prior to January 1, 1968, as a result of such amendment; nor shall funds be withheld from any such State by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents the State from complying with the requirements of such amendment until the first day of the fourth month after the State legislature next adjourns following the effective date of this Act.

VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

SEC. 107. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROGRAMS

"VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of fulltime volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups, including elderly and retired Americans, to perform meaningful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant workers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement.

"PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

"AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

"SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and upon request of Fed-

eral, State, or local agencies, or private nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to work—

"(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

"(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and

"(3) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

"(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine; but volunteers under this part shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

"TERMS OF SERVICE

"SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be required to make a full-time personal commitment to combating poverty. This shall include a commitment to live among and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain available for service without regard to regular working hours, at all times during their term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.

"(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to training. The Director may, however, allow persons who are unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than two months where he determines that this more limited service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

"(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to that oath or affirmation.

"SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

"SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to volunteers under this part while they are in training and on assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance with standards prescribed by him, have been designated volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills. The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel (including travel to and from the place of training), and leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

"(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend, or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 5582).

"(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience which they have derived from their training and service in the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty as members of the helping professions.

"PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

"COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs designed to expand opportunities for persons to participate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment under section 810, and in their home or nearby communities, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical, or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are undertaken in connection with these programs. These projects may include, without limitation, activities designed (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2) to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for the development or betterment of neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the competence necessary to take advantage of public and private resources which would not otherwise be available or used for those programs; and (3) to assist existing national and local agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical needs.

"(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such other support or allowances as the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, are required because of unusual or special circumstances affecting the project.

"(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the Director under this section in providing for or assisting in the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such person.

"SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of providing volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

"PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

"SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title with one another, with community action programs, and with other related Federal, State, local, and national programs. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible, actions to promote service by volunteers or former volun-

teers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in providing necessary support to programs under part B, and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State, local, and national agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging greater use of volunteer services in those programs and establishing in connection with them systematic procedures for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orientation or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant to this part.

"PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS"

"SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall take necessary steps, including the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest feasible participation of older persons in the various programs and activities authorized under this title.

"APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW"

"SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment.

"(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services or training, (1) be deemed, for the purpose of subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, persons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a) (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in 116(a) (2) (B) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

"SPECIAL LIMITATIONS"

"SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that service under this title is limited to activities which would not otherwise be performed and which will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service.

"(b) All support, including transportation provided to volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest possible cost consistent with the effective operations of volunteer programs.

"(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such agency or organization.

"DURATION OF PROGRAM"

"SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law."

TITLE II—SUMMER CAMPS FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Summer Camp Act of 1967".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 202. Millions of acres of forest and park lands throughout the Nation are the property of all the people. Yet the circumstances of poverty frequently prevent the utilization of these lands by those most in need, particularly disadvantaged children who would benefit from outdoor and camping experiences. It is the purpose of this

title to provide and assist in the provision of camp facilities which permit greater use of such public lands under Federal, State, and local administration in behalf of these children.

BASIC AUTHORITY

SEC. 203. (a) The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the "Director") may allocate funds to other Federal agencies, or extend financial assistance to State or local public agencies, to enable them to provide camp facilities for use by disadvantaged children. The following basic conditions shall apply to the exercise of this authority—

(1) the facilities (except as may be necessary in connection with access roads, utility lines, or similar installations) must be on public lands;

(2) the facilities must be so located in relation to population centers as to permit their efficient, meaningful, and substantial use in connection with camping programs, projects, or activities for disadvantaged children; and

(3) the facilities must be provided and operated subject to a use plan, conforming to the requirements of section 205, which provides reasonable assurance of their continuing availability, under the sponsorship of one or more public or private nonprofit agencies, for such camping programs, projects, or activities.

ALLOCATION AND USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 204. (a) Funds appropriated under this title may be allocated by the Director to the Secretaries of Agriculture, the Interior, or to the Army, to pay the cost of camp facilities on public lands under their administration, or to the head of any other Federal agency responsible for the administration of public lands which are determined by the Director and the head of that agency to be appropriate for use in providing camp facilities pursuant to this Act. Funds may also be provided, by grant or contract, to State or local public agencies responsible for administration of public lands and having the legal, technical, and financial capacity to undertake projects for the provision of camp facilities in accordance with this title.

(b) Funds allocated to a Federal agency, or made available for any State or local project, may be used for—

(1) the construction, renovation, or improvement (including furnishing and equipping) of camp facilities;

(2) the purchase or lease of privately owned facilities on public lands which are or may be made suitable for use as camp facilities; and

(3) essential maintenance and supervision of camp facilities to the extent, as may be agreed upon by the Director and the agency concerned, that such maintenance and supervision is not otherwise available or cannot otherwise be reasonably provided.

(c) Funds allocated or made available under this title may not be used for the administration or operation of any camping program or project, nor may they be used for the purchase of land; but this shall not preclude their use in acquiring necessary rights in connection with access roads, utility lines, or similar installations.

USE PLANS

SEC. 205. (a) Funds shall not be allocated and used by a Federal agency for any facility, and the Director shall not extend financial assistance to any State or local agency project, unless the facility or project is covered by a use plan or agreement approved by the Director in accordance with this section. In the case of facilities to be provided by a Federal agency, the plan shall contain such information and understandings concerning the character of the facility, the type and extent of use to be made of it, the number and nature of and procedure for selecting sponsoring organizations, conformity with

the rules and regulations of the administering agency, and other matters, as may be agreed upon by the Director and the head of that agency. In the case of projects of State or local public bodies, the plan shall contain, at a minimum, information and commitments necessary to assure—

(1) that the facilities will be adequate, and reasonable in cost, in relation to their proposed use;

(2) that the facilities and their proposed use will comply with all applicable laws and regulations and be consistent with any applicable plans or planning, including any statewide outdoor recreation plans approved pursuant to the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965;

(3) that the facilities will be available for use in accordance with this title over an appropriate minimum period, consistent with their cost, and that they will not be converted to any other use during that period except with the approval of the Director and subject to such additional conditions or requirements (which may include required repayment of all or part of the financial assistance, as determined after opportunity for hearing) as the Director may prescribe;

(4) that the agency seeking financial assistance will retain sufficient continuing control over the facilities to assure their continuing use in accordance with this title over the applicable minimum period; and

(5) that there are public or private nonprofit sponsoring organizations (which may include the applicant agency) which are able and willing to assume responsibility for operating or coordinating the operation of the facilities so as to assure their effective and efficient use for camping programs for disadvantaged children, and that there are adequate methods of procedures for selecting those sponsoring organizations.

(b) The Director after consultation with the heads of interested Federal agencies may by regulation prescribe additional or supplementary requirements or criteria for use plans. Such regulations may include descriptions of different types of camping programs for which facilities provided or assisted under this title may be used, general standards for these various types of programs, and requirements or procedures for selecting sponsoring organizations in accordance with their capacity to provide or arrange for the staff, health care, food, transportation, and other supportive services needed for such programs. The regulations may also require specific approval of sponsoring organizations by the Director.

USE OF FACILITIES BY OTHER THAN THE DISADVANTAGED

SEC. 206. Facilities provided or assisted under this title shall not be used for groups other than disadvantaged children unless it is determined, by the Director or in accordance with regulations promulgated by him establishing criteria for such determinations, that the facilities would otherwise not be adequately utilized, that it is not reasonably possible to expand their use for disadvantaged children, and that use by other organizations or groups would not preclude or be inconsistent with the fullest practicable use of the facilities for disadvantaged children. The Director shall consult with the Federal agencies concerned and, where feasible, with interested State and local agencies in issuing regulations under this section. Those regulations may provide for use by groups other than disadvantaged children on a fee basis, and may require in the case of any State or local public agencies that fees so collected be applied in reduction of the amount of financial assistance provided under this title.

EMPLOYMENT OF LOW-INCOME PERSONS

SEC. 207. To the extent feasible, the Director shall encourage the provision, maintenance, supervision, and use of camp facilities

ities in a manner that will promote new or additional employment or training opportunities for low-income individuals, including individuals enrolled in the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other programs designed to improve or restore employability.

LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 208. Financial assistance under this title to any State or local public agency for any project or activity shall not exceed 80 per centum of the approved cost of such project or activity. Not shall the Director provide such assistance to any such agency unless he satisfies himself that the prior level of agency expenditures in connection with other facilities available to disadvantaged children has not been and will not be reduced and that contributions or expenditures in connection with those other facilities will not be diminished in order to provide any non-Federal contributions required under this section. Non-Federal contributions required by this section may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to materials, equipment, and services.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 209. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration, or repair, including painting and decorating, of projects, buildings, and works which are federally assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—176a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1960 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 210. To the extent necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title, the Director shall have the powers and duties conferred upon him by section 602 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, except that he may make arrangements with, reimburse, or delegate any powers to, the heads of other Federal agencies, including agencies to which funds are allocated under section 204(a), and authorize redelegations, without regard to the provisions of section 602(d) of such Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 211. For purposes of this title—

(1) The term "camp facilities" includes permanent or semipermanent structures, sanitary, water, cooking, electrical or similar installations or fixtures, access roads and utility lines and installations necessary for adequate development of a site, recreational installations appropriate to a campsite, and such other furnishings, equipment, installations, or structures as may be required to provide a site appropriate for regular or repeated use in connection with camping programs for disadvantaged children;

(2) The term "State or local public agency" means a State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity or public body, an Indian tribe, or two or more such entities, bodies, or tribes, having necessary control over public lands and otherwise authorized to undertake the commitments required pursuant to this title with respect to any camp facility;

(3) The term "public lands" means those lands under the ownership, control, or administration of Federal, State, or local public agencies or Indian tribes;

(4) The term "sponsoring organization" means a welfare, youth, charitable, church, or labor organization, a school, civic club, or community action agency established pur-

suant to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, or any other public or private nonprofit agency (other than a political party) which has authority to operate, administer, or coordinate camping programs for disadvantaged children using facilities provided under this title; and

(5) The term "disadvantaged children" means children from low-income families, and includes groups predominantly or principally composed of such children.

AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 212. For the purposes of carrying out this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

TITLE III—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) Whoever, being an officer, director, agent, or employee of, or connected in any capacity with, any agency receiving financial assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act, as amended, embezzles, willfully misapplies, steals, or obtains by fraud any of the moneys, funds, assets, or property which are the subject of a grant or contract of assistance pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act, as amended, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both; but if the amount so embezzled, misapplied, stolen, or obtained by fraud does not exceed \$100, he shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Whoever, by threat of procuring dismissal of any person from employment or of refusal to employ or refusal to renew a contract of employment in connection with a grant or contract of assistance under the Economic Opportunity Act, as amended, induces any person to give up any money or thing of any value to any person (including such grantee agency), shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

The index, section-by-section analysis, and summary presented by Mr. CLARK, are as follows:

CAPTION INDEX TO ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Sec. 1. Short Title

Sec. 2. Authorization of appropriations

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Job Corps amendments

Provides a new part A for the Economic Opportunity Act as follows:

"Sec. 101. Statement of Purpose

"Sec. 102. Establishment of Job Corps

"Sec. 103. Individuals Eligible for the Job Corps

"Sec. 104. Screening and Selection of Applicants—General Provisions

"Sec. 105. Screening and Selection—Special Limitations

"Sec. 106. Enrollment and Assignment

"Sec. 107. Job Corps Centers

"Sec. 108. Program Activities

"Sec. 109. Allowance and Support

"Sec. 110. Standards of Conduct

"Sec. 111. Community Participation

"Sec. 112. Placement and Follow-Through

"Sec. 113. Evaluation; Experimental and Developmental Projects

"Sec. 114. Advisory Boards and Committees

"Sec. 115. Participation of the States

"Sec. 116. Application of Provisions of Federal Law

"Sec. 117. Special Limitations

"Sec. 118. Political Discrimination and Political Activity"

Sec. 102. Work and Training Programs

Consolidates parts B and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act as a new part

B, "Work and Training for Youth and Adults", as follows:

"Sec. 120. Statement of Purpose

"Sec. 121. Neighborhood Youth Corps

"Sec. 122. Community Employment and Training Programs

"Sec. 123. Special Urban Employment Impact Programs

"Sec. 124. Coordination

"Sec. 125. Program Participants: Application of Federal Laws

"Sec. 126. General Conditions for Program Approval

"Sec. 127. Equitable Distribution of Assistance

"Sec. 128. Technical Assistance and Training

"Sec. 129. Limitations on Federal Assistance

"Sec. 130. Evaluation"

Sec. 103. Community Action Programs

Provides a new title II for the Economic Opportunity Act as follows:

"Sec. 201. Statement of Purpose

"Part A—Community Action Agencies and Programs

"Sec. 210. Establishment of Community Action Agencies; Community Action Programs

"Sec. 211. Structure of Community Action Agencies

"Sec. 212. Specific Powers and Functions of Community Action Agencies

"Sec. 213. State and Regional Agencies

"Sec. 214. Administrative Standards

"Sec. 215. Evaluation of Community Action Agencies and Programs

"Part B—Financial Assistance to Community Action Programs and Related Activities

"Sec. 220. Development of Community Action Programs

"Sec. 221. General Provisions for Financial Assistance to Community Action Programs

"Sec. 222. Special Programs and Assistance

"Sec. 223. Allotment of Funds; Limitations on Assistance

"Part C—Supplemental Programs and Activities

"Sec. 230. Technical Assistance and Training

"Sec. 231. State Agency Assistance

"Sec. 232. Research and Pilot Programs

"Part D—General and Technical Provisions

"Sec. 240. Rural Areas

"Sec. 241. Coordination—Federal Agencies; Use of State Funds

"Sec. 242. Submission of Plans to Governors

"Sec. 243. Fiscal Responsibility and Audit

"Sec. 244. Special Limitations

"Sec. 245. Duration of Program"

Sec. 104. Amendments to Title III—Rural Areas Programs

Subsections (a) through (d) of section 104 redesignate part A of title III of the Economic Opportunity Act as "Rural Loan Program" and provide amendments relating to that program. Subsection (e) provides for an amended part B, "Assistance for Migrant, and Other Seasonally Employed, Farm Workers and Their Families", as follows:

"Sec. 311. Statement of Purpose

"Sec. 312. Financial Assistance

"Sec. 313. Limitations on Assistance

"Sec. 314. Technical Assistance, Training and Evaluation"

Sec. 105. Amendments to Title VI—Administration and Coordination

Provides various amendments to this title of the Economic Opportunity Act, including a new part B, "Coordination", as follows:

"Sec. 630. Statement of Purpose

"Sec. 631. Economic Opportunity Council

"Sec. 632. Responsibilities of the Director

"Sec. 633. Cooperation of Federal Agencies

- "Sec. 634. Combinations Among Projects and Programs
- "Sec. 635. Information Center
- "Sec. 636. Prohibition
- "Sec. 637. Special Responsibilities: Training Programs
- "Sec. 638. Definitions"

Sec. 106. Amendment to Title VII

Provides a new title VII for the Economic Opportunity Act, "Treatment of Income for Certain Public Assistance Purposes", as follows:

- "Sec. 701. Statement of Purpose
- "Sec. 702. State Plans
- "Sec. 703. Definitions
- "Sec. 704. Attribution of Income
- "Sec. 705. Amount of Public Assistance
- "Sec. 706. Savings Provision"

Sec. 107. Volunteer Programs

Provides a new title VIII for the Economic Opportunity Act, "Domestic Volunteer Service Programs 'Volunteers in Service To America'", as follows:

- "Sec. 801. Statement of Purpose

"Part A—Full-Time Volunteer Programs

- "Sec. 810. Authority to Establish Full-Time Programs
- "Sec. 811. Terms of Service
- "Sec. 812. Support of Full-Time Volunteers

"Part B—Auxiliary and Special Volunteer Programs

- "Sec. 820. Community Service Programs
- "Sec. 821. Special Volunteer Programs

Part C—General Provisions

- "Sec. 831. Coordination with Other Programs
- "Sec. 832. Participation of Older Persons
- "Sec. 833. Application of Federal Law
- "Sec. 834. Special Limitations
- "Sec. 835. Duration of Program"

TITLE II—SUMMER CAMPS FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

- Sec. 201. Short title
- Sec. 202. Findings and Declaration of Purpose
- Sec. 203. Basic Authority
- Sec. 204. Allocation and Use of Funds
- Sec. 205. Use Plans
- Sec. 206. Use of Facilities by Other Than the Disadvantaged
- Sec. 207. Employment of Low-Income Persons
- Sec. 208. Limitation on Financial Assistance
- Sec. 209. Labor Standards
- Sec. 210. General Provisions
- Sec. 211. Definitions
- Sec. 212. Authorizations

TITLE III—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

- Sec. 301. (Relates to embezzlement, theft, kickbacks or extortion involving financial assistance funds under the Economic Opportunity Act)

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS—ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS

Section 101 of the bill would generally revise the provisions of title I-A of the Economic Opportunity Act governing the Job Corps. As it would be amended, the new part A would more accurately reflect the current program than does the present law. It would also afford a better basis for the common efforts of all the agencies and organizations participating in the Job Corps to make that program increasingly effective and efficient in helping the many disadvantaged young men and women who need and can benefit from the kind of intensive assistance Job Corps is designed to provide. The provisions of the amended new part A are described below.

Section 101. Statement of Purpose: The current statement of purpose for this program merely declares its intent to prepare young men and women for the responsibilities of citizenship and to increase their employability. The proposed new section 101

would provide a more specific statement of the mission to assist low-income, disadvantaged young men and women "who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting distinct from their current environment, to become more responsible, employable and productive citizens." Also, the amended statement of purpose declares that the Job Corps programs are to be carried out in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of national, State, and community resources, and "to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private institutions and agencies."

Section 102. Establishment of the Job Corps: As does the present law, the amended statute establishes within the Office of Economic Opportunity a "Job Corps."

Section 103. Individuals Eligible for the Job Corps: Except for specifying age and citizenship requirements for enrollment in the Job Corps, the existing law is silent as to the criteria to be applied in determining whether an applicant is eligible to enter the program.

The new section would be much more specific. Under its terms, an eligible applicant is a young person of low income or from a low-income family who requires additional education, training, or intensive counseling and related assistance in order to participate successfully in regular school work, qualify for other training programs suitable to his needs or satisfy Armed Forces requirements. His current environment must also be one which is so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive home life or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair his prospects for successful participation in any other program providing needed training, education or assistance. However, these circumstances alone will not qualify him for admission to the program. He must, in addition, be determined after careful screening (in accordance with procedures spelled out in sections 104 and 105 of the Act) to have the present capabilities and aspirations necessary to complete the program and secure its full benefits, and he must be free of medical and behavioral problems which are so serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or the pattern of work and training which the program involves. To be eligible for enrollment, an applicant may also be required to meet other standards of enrollment prescribed by the Director, and he must agree to comply with all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

Section 104. Screening and Selection of Applicants—General Provisions: This section would require that, to the extent practicable, screening and selection of enrollees be carried on through arrangements utilizing public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups and labor organizations. The Director must also under this section prescribe rules to establish specific standards and procedures for the conduct of screening and selection activities, and must encourage recruitment through agencies having contact with youths over substantial periods of time. This latter requirement recognizes that these agencies, because of their long-term contact with young persons, would be able to provide reliable information concerning the problems of youths seeking to enter the program. Provision is also made for consultation with other individuals and organizations including courts, probation and parole offices, law enforcement authorities, schools, welfare agencies, medical agencies, and advisors. The screening procedures would include an interview with each applicant, one of the purposes being to give the applicant a full

understanding of the Job Corps and to make clear what will be expected of him as an enrollee if he is accepted. Also, in order to develop and, as appropriate, verify information concerning matters relating to the applicant's eligibility, a careful and systematic inquiry regarding his background would be required.

As with the existing law, the Director would be prohibited from making payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.

Section 105. Screening and Selection—Special Limitations: As a precaution against the enrollment of persons in the Job Corps whose affiliation with it would be likely to detract from the effectiveness of the program or have other damaging results, the amended law specifically limits enrollment to persons meeting certain basic qualifications as to character and social adjustment.

Under the provisions of section 105, an individual may be selected as an enrollee only if it is determined that he can participate successfully in group situations and activities with other enrollees, and that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior which would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefits of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities. It must also be determined that he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to observe those rules.

Under this new section an individual will be considered as failing to meet these requirements if he has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction or other major behavioral aberrations. The Director is also required to specify in rules and regulations issued under this section, the specific actions or attributes which shall preclude selection, and those rules or regulations are to be binding on all agencies authorized to screen or select persons for enrollment. For example, existing directives of the Job Corps prohibit the enrollment of persons having a record of serious criminal behavior, including such offenses as murder, forcible rape, arson, armed robbery, assault with a deadly weapon, and narcotics addiction.

The Director is given authority in certain situations in which exceptional circumstances exist, to authorize the enrollment of persons notwithstanding their being subject to a specific disqualification. However, in such instances the selection must be fully consistent with the prescribed standards relating to the interests of other enrollees, the maintenance of discipline, and satisfactory community relations.

This section would continue the Director's present authority to enroll persons on probation or parole under certain circumstances. It would also add requirements assuring a continuing review of the prescribed screening criteria and procedures and assuring that all screening agencies comply with them.

Section 106. Enrollment and Assignment: The proposed new part A would continue existing provisions of the law: (1) limiting Job Corps enrollment, generally, to two years, (2) declaring that enrollment will not relieve any individual of his obligations for military service, (3) requiring an oath of allegiance to the United States (except from Cuban refugees), and (4) requiring the assignment of at least 40 percent of male enrollees to centers where they will be primarily engaged in conservation or similar work activities. It also would continue in slightly modified form the requirement relating to the assignment of enrollees to centers nearest their homes.

Section 107. Job Corps Centers: Although the present Act authorizes the establishment and operation of conservation camps and training centers, it is less than specific as to the intended functions of Job Corps establishments and the types of activities which are contemplated for Job Corps programs.

As it would be amended, the law would specify that there shall be conservation centers, located primarily in rural areas, which will provide, in addition to other training and assistance, programs of work experience which are focused on conservation type activities. It would also provide for the establishment and operation of Men's Training Centers and Women's Training Centers to be located in either urban or rural areas. The Men's Training Centers would include training and other services for enrollees who can be expected to participate successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semi-skilled employment, and the Women's Training Centers would provide education, training, and other activities suited to the needs and potentialities of young women.

Section 108. Program Activities: The proposed law would require that each Job Corps center provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized and fully supervised program of education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. The required program must also, to the maximum feasible extent, include activities to assist an enrollee to choose realistic career goals, and to cope with problems he may encounter in his home community or in adjusting to a new community, and in planning and managing his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-term upward mobility.

In addition to specifying the types of program activities which are to be carried on in the various centers, this section contemplates that those activities shall aggregate at least 60 hours a week in the case of each corpsman. Also, in order to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline, the proposed section would require that center programs include required participation in center maintenance support and related work activity.

The present law requires that, to the extent feasible, arrangements for education and training of enrollees shall provide opportunities for qualified participants to obtain education and training necessary to qualify them for the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school. However, there are often cases where an enrollee is unable to qualify for an equivalency certificate, even though he may have made very substantial progress in his education so as to leave the Job Corps with skills far above those with which he entered. In recognition of this problem, this section would provide for certificates to be developed by the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which could be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their service in the Job Corps and which would reflect the enrollees' level of educational attainment. The prospect of acquiring such a certificate should prove to be an added inducement for successful participation in the program and will provide important assistance to enrollees in obtaining employment or realizing other career goals which might otherwise be closed to them on the basis of their pre-Job Corps educational attainment.

Subsection (d) of this section continues the existing requirement that the Job Corps work experience programs not displace employed workers in the community or impair existing contracts for service. It also adds a requirement that these programs must be coordinated with other work experience programs, such as a Neighborhood Youth Corps project, in the community.

Section 109. Allowance and Support: As does the present law, the amended statute

would authorize the payment of personal and readjustment allowances to Job Corps enrollees.

The proposed new law would establish personal allowances for enrollees at a rate not to exceed \$50 per month, and provide that allowances should be graduated up to the maximum so as to encourage achievement and the best use by enrollees of the funds provided them. These allowances would be subject to reduction in appropriate cases as a disciplinary measure, and to the degree reasonable, enrollees would be required to meet or contribute to costs associated with their individual comfort from their personal allowances.

Like the existing law, the proposed legislation would authorize a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory service in the Job Corps. However, it would specifically authorize reduction of the allowance as a disciplinary measure, and except in unusual circumstances determined by the Director, no enrollee would be entitled to such an allowance unless he has remained in the program for at least 90 days. Specific authority is also provided the Director to make advances to or on behalf of enrollees out of their readjustment allowance in order to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by them.

Another provision of the proposed law requires that the Director prescribe specific rules governing the accrual of leave by enrollees and a provision prohibiting his assumption of transportation costs in connection with an enrollee's leave unless he has completed at least six months' service in the Job Corps.

Section 110. Standards of Conduct: The authority contained in section 111 of the present law would be retained in this section.

Section 111. Community Participation: Section 104(h) of the present Act requires Job Corps officials, whenever possible, to "stimulate formation of indigenous community activity in areas which surround Job Corps centers to provide a friendly and adequate reception of enrollees into community life". This very general provision would be expanded by this section to include the establishment of community advisory councils in which youth participation is to be encouraged, and, where feasible, the establishment of separate youth councils. The Director would also be required to establish necessary rules and take necessary action to assure that each center is operated in such a manner as to promote good community relationships and to achieve certain specified objectives. These include a variety of actions designed to afford residents of such communities a meaningful voice in center affairs and the opportunity to participate personally in program activities. For example, community officials would be given appropriate advance notice of changes in center rules, procedures, or activities that might affect or be of interest to the community, and the community would participate in the development of policies concerning such matters as the issuance and terms of passes to Job Corps enrollees.

Section 112. Placement and Follow-Through: The amended law would specifically authorize the Director to provide, or arrange for, necessary services designed to assist enrollees to obtain suitable employment or to undertake other activities such as further training or education. To the extent feasible, placement services would be undertaken through public or private agencies which are best able to provide enrollees with reasonable follow-through, including counseling and guidance to assist them in making a satisfactory initial adjustment.

Section 113.—Evaluation; Experimental and Demonstration Projects: The proposed amendments add to the Act a requirement that the Director provide for the careful and

systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program from the standpoint of benefits provided and the effectiveness of its procedures, policies, and methods of operation. In doing this, he is to consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs. The Director is also to obtain from employers, schools, government and private agencies specific information concerning former enrollees relating such things as their residence, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life, and, to the extent feasible, must also secure similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program.

This section also authorizes the Director to make grants or contracts for experimental, research or demonstration projects for developing or testing ways of securing better use of facilities; encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of enrollment; reducing transportation and support costs; or otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the Job Corps program. These projects would be undertaken after consultation with appropriate Federal officials and would include one or more projects to provide youths with education, training and other supportive services on a combined residential and non-residential basis. Similar authority is provided in the existing law regarding the establishment of projects operated on such a combined basis.

Section 114. Advisory Boards and Committees: Section 602(c) of the present Act authorizes the Director to appoint such advisory committees as he deems necessary to advise him with respect to his functions under the Act. This new section in the revised statute directs that he shall make use of such committees and boards in the operation of the Job Corps and its centers, whenever he determines that the availability of outside advice and counsel on a regular basis would be "of substantial benefit in identifying and overcoming problems, in planning program or center development, or in strengthening relationships between the Job Corps and agencies and institutions and groups engaged in related activities. . . ."

Section 115. Participation of the States: The amended law continues the authority of State Governors regarding the approval of plans for Job Corps centers, and it retains the present Act's provisions authorizing the Director to assist in the operation and administration of State-operated programs. A new provision would be added, however, requiring the Director to take necessary action to facilitate the effective participation of the States in the Job Corps program. This would include consultation with State agencies on matters pertaining to the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of enrollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaningful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and coordination with State-operated programs.

Section 116. Application of Provisions of Federal Law: The provisions of the amended statute in this area are substantially the same as contained in the present law, with one exception. This would permit settlement of claims not exceeding \$500 for damage to persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job Corps even though the claims were not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act. This authority is the same as that granted under existing law to the Postmaster General in the operation of the Post Office Department.

Section 117. Capacity, Enrollment, and Cost Limitations: The amended legislation would prohibit the use of funds made available to carry out the Job Corps program in the fiscal year 1968 in such a manner as

to increase above 45,000 the enrollee capacity of Job Corps centers.

The 1966 amendments to the Act require the Director to ensure that on or before July 1, 1967, the number of women in residence, and receiving training at Job Corps centers is not less than 23 percent of the total number of enrollees in the Job Corps. The present proposal provides that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of enrollees in residence and receiving training, at least 25 percent shall be women.

The 1966 amendments require the Director to take necessary action to ensure that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$7,500 per enrollee in such centers. The current proposal reduces the allowable cost per enrollee to \$7,300.

Section 118. Political Discrimination and Political Activity: The amended statute would retain, unchanged, the provisions of the existing law on this subject.

WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

The amendments in section 102 set forth, in one part, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, several existing employment and training authorities now contained in title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, and a modified special urban employment program now found in title I-D of the Act. It is designed to permit the better coordination of various now distinct but similar programs, to allow communities increased flexibility in using existing authorities in a way most responsive to local needs and problems, and to provide a basis on which these authorities can be combined with additional funds for programs designed to deal in distinctly new ways with some of the extremely complex problems of unemployment and underemployment affecting the poor in city slums. The various sections of the proposed new part B are explained below.

Section 120. Statement of Purpose: This section sets forth the purposes of the part so as to include the Neighborhood Youth Corps, work and training programs for youth and adults, and the new urban employment program.

Section 121. Neighborhood Youth Corps: This section parallels, with no substantial change, the existing operating authority for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, with separate provision for in-school and out-of-school programs.

Section 122.—Community Employment and Training Programs: This section would affect a partial consolidation of sections 205 (d) and (e) of the Economic Opportunity Act, with a number of amendments designed to make the programs authorized under these provisions more flexible tools for meeting local needs. Its effect would be to permit localities to design projects which incorporate elements of both the section 205 (d) and section 205(e) programs and to include in those projects youth over 16 as well as adults. In this respect, the new section would extend to communities generally, including rural communities, some of the same basic flexibility that is now possible for projects in urban areas under part D of title I of the Act. In addition, the new section would permit projects which include on-the-job training with private employers as well as work-training in "public service" activities, a feature now authorized for Neighborhood Youth Corps projects but not generally possible in the adult programs.

The programs now authorized under sections 205(d) and 205(e) of the Economic Opportunity Act both serve to assist low-income unemployed persons to secure regular employment, and both involve work experience activities in Federally-assisted projects. The programs have a somewhat different focus. In the case of one, the section 205(d) program, the focus has been

upon placing people in work activities or work-training stations involving conservation, park improvement, beautification or similar activities, with emphasis on rural areas and projects involving older people; in the case of the other, the section 205(e) program, the focus is upon training stations involving the provision of health, education or similar public services which will lead to sub-professional, new careers. The programs are, however, sufficiently similar that a variety of community betterment and public services projects could be undertaken under either statutory authority. Under the present Act, both are limited to adults; and in this respect neither has the flexibility of the urban employment program added last year to title I as part D which draws upon the same basic authority but permits projects which include youth as well as adults. Both are limited to work-training activities in various "public interest" fields; and neither, in this respect has the same flexibility as the Neighborhood Youth Corps which allows enrollees to be assigned to virtually any kind of work-training station which could be covered under 205(d) and (e) but in addition, as a result of last year's amendments, permits assignment to on-the-job training with private profit-making employers.

Under arrangements now in effect, the section 205(d) and (e) programs have been combined for administrative purposes, together with the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the urban employment program authorized under current part D of title I, to be operated under a single delegation by the Department of Labor. One of the objectives of the delegation is to effect a greater measure of coordination among similar related programs. These arrangements tend to assure greater uniformity and consistency among the programs at the Federal level, and they should also serve to help localities and potential sponsors to plan more intelligently to use the several statutory authorities covered by the delegation. They do not, however, overcome the difficulties which diverse authorities by their nature pose for localities seeking to deal comprehensively with local needs. Nor do they adequately deal with the problem of individuals who may now fall "between the cracks" of the existing statutory authorities or assure a statutory base for programs that will be most flexible in responding to changing national or local economic conditions.

It may today be very difficult for a given community to put together a single project that efficiently and effectively draws upon all the assistance that is available to meet the needs of its low-income and unemployed residents. If, for example, a project is to include both individuals 20 or 21 as well as older persons, the sponsor must look to at least two programs—the Neighborhood Youth Corps, on the one hand, and either the 205(d) or 205(e) program on the other. If there are in the community both possibilities for sub-professional "new career" type work-training and work-training involving the improvement of parks or other public facilities, the sponsor may find it necessary to operate under not two but three different programs—NYC, section 205(d) and section 205 (e). Moreover, even with grants or contracts under all three programs, a sponsoring agency may find itself in a position where it cannot include in its activities for adults the same on-the-job training opportunities that it could provide under its NYC contract or agreement for younger participants.

The practical problems this sort of situation may create in terms of unnecessary effort and red-tape are almost endless. These problems may exist not only on a community basis, but also in connection with a single or similar group of "employers." A group of

hospitals, for example, may well be able to provide work-training stations for both youth and adults, and provide work opportunities of the kind appropriate under both the section 205(d) and 205(e) programs. Designing a project to exploit all of these opportunities is apt to be pretty complicated if grants or contracts must be secured under three separate programs. The problem would become even more complicated if, in addition, there were possibilities for moving people from hospital employment to on-the-job training positions with private for-profit employers who were in a position and prepared to provide permanent, meaningful employment that the hospitals themselves might not be able to provide.

Nor is the problem only one of the sponsoring and employing agencies. In a given rural area, for example, there may presently be an insufficient number of sub-professional, "new career" type jobs to suggest or justify a separate project—even though there might be possibilities for designing a more comprehensive project in which a few of these positions might be included. A combined project might thus serve to make possible for some individuals in the community long-term career opportunities of a type which could not otherwise be provided. Similarly, "new career" sub-professional type jobs are, by their nature, apt to be more demanding in terms of the individual's capacity for acquiring educational and technical skills than the typical work-activity under a section 205(d) project. At present, if a person originally selected for a sub-professional project proves after some months unable to progress satisfactorily, he may have no place to go except back to the unemployment rolls. With greater coordination and combined projects, it might well be possible for such a person to remain in the same project and continue training for a different type permanent job. Similarly, people originally selected for lower-skill training, who prove to have abilities beyond those originally seen, could move up to sub-professional training—again, with no hiatus and in the same project.

The possibility of changes in national or local economic conditions also argue for encouraging project combinations involving use of existing authorities. For example, at a time when unemployment is dropping sharply in a community, there may be new opportunities for permanent placement of persons in the private sector who were originally selected in the expectation of eventual employment in a public service agency or institution. Ready availability of on-the-job training authority permits the project to be adjusted to take account of this possibility with a minimum of delay. Similarly, at a time when unemployment is rising, there may be a relatively rapid rise in the number of persons who could benefit from and need the type of work-training assistance available under the section 205(d) program. Permitting a rapid modification of projects to reflect this sort of change is plainly desirable—particularly in view of the fact that some of the individuals assisted initially in 205(d)-type activities might later be shifted within the same project to higher, normally preferred types of work-experience as additional work-station opportunities of this kind were developed.

The new section 122 would not in any way limit the separate status of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. It would, however, permit the initiation of projects based on existing section 205(d) and (e) authority which could include youth as well as adults. It would not preclude projects focused upon or limited to conservation-type work activities, such as might now be undertaken under the current section 205(d) authority, or projects focused upon or limited to work activities designed to qualify people for sub-

professional employment, such as might now be undertaken under current section 205(e) authority. It would, however, permit communities to combine both of types work-activities in a single project—with a single contract or grant, using one authority and one funding resource.

Further, as in the case of out-of-school NYC, projects could be designed under this section which would include on-the-job training with private profit-making firms. It is contemplated, however, that in most cases work-training would be concentrated in fields where there exist critical unmet needs—such as the development of recreational areas or public parks, conservation of national resources, or the provision of health, education, welfare or public safety services.

Under the new section, all projects must as a minimum be designed to enable participants to qualify for regular, permanent employment without further assistance. And wherever possible, they should be designed to enable participants to secure entry level jobs with career opportunities for regular or continued advancement. They would also have to include basic education, health, counseling and other supportive services as necessary for participants to attain these employment objectives.

Subsection (d) of this section sets forth a number of specific criteria to be used in determining whether, in what amount and on what conditions to assist projects. Consideration in all cases would have to be given to the efforts made by an applicant agency to obtain for participants assurances of regular non-assisted employment at the earliest feasible time. Also in every case the project proposal would have to be considered in terms of whether it was developed and realistically structured so as to take account of the desires, needs, and capabilities of participants.

Further, in the case of projects where participants would be involved in work-training activities involving physical facilities, consideration would have to be given to whether those facilities will be substantially used by the poor or benefit low-income areas. And, in the case of projects designed to develop entry-level job opportunities, consideration would have to be given to the impact which the particular project is likely to have in the community in promoting the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs, eliminating artificial barriers to employment of the poor, or opening new career possibilities.

Section 123. Special Urban Employment Impact Programs: This section would authorize a special program to deal with critical problems of unemployment and underemployment affecting the poor in urban slum areas. Twenty-five percent of funds under the new title I would be reserved for these programs.

The program authorized by this section would build upon part D of title I of the current Act, which it would supersede. As in the case of the part D program, it reflects the view that there is a critical need in many of our urban areas for a special effort to meet problems of unemployment and underemployment, and that it is feasible today in many of those areas to marshal the resources and job opportunities needed to permit relatively rapid and meaningful progress in overcoming these problems. Like the part D program, the program authorized under this section contemplates projects of sufficient size and scope to have substantial impact. It would, however, place somewhat less emphasis than part D upon neighborhood or area improvement and somewhat more emphasis upon assuring that each individual is provided with all of the assistance needed to move from initial selection, through pre-work orientation, vocational training, work-experience, and job placement, until he reaches the point where he not only has a

meaningful job but has developed the capacity to hold that job. It also is predicted upon projects using a broader range of resources, including the Manpower Development and Training Act, than the present part D and it would authorize greater flexibility in the use of funds to supplement those resources.

The new program contemplates unusually intensive supportive services and follow-through, focused upon the needs of each individual participant, so as to best assure that the participant develops the attitudes and work skills necessary to hold, suitable, permanent employment in the competitive labor market. This approach is designed to permit the program to assist to full self-sufficiency many potentially employable people who cannot be reached under any existing program. In many of our larger urban areas, job opportunities can now be made available in substantial numbers for these people if they can qualify. The objective is a program that can be effective in qualifying any individual whose employment problems can, reasonably, be overcome given all the training techniques now available.

In addition to serving an urban area having an especially large concentration of unemployment, under-employed or low-income individuals, a project under this section must meet a number of specified criteria. It must, first, be supported by commitments of cooperation on the part of employers, which will include assurances relating to the provision of permanent employment opportunities consistent with the size, scope and objectives of the program. It must also provide for maximum feasible use of other related resources, including commitments of specific training opportunities under the Manpower Development and Training Act. It must be designed to assure that work and training opportunities are extended, so far as possible, to the most severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be expected to benefit. And it must include or provide for the intensive or improved supportive services—day care, transportation, health, and intensive and continuing counseling, both before and after job placement—necessary to assist participants to secure, hold and advance in regular competitive employment.

Under this section, communities could be assisted to plan and develop eligible projects. The goal in this respect would be to develop, in effect, a core program making use of all available resources relating to the training of individuals to improve or restore their employability. Financial assistance would then be extended to expand or supplement these projects; to provide supportive services not otherwise available; or to initiate as part of the program new Neighborhood Youth Corps or community employment and training projects as otherwise authorized under the new part B.

Section 124. Coordination: This section provides that programs under the new part B shall be carried on with appropriate assistance from other Federal agencies and be coordinated with related programs, including maximum coordination with community action programs. Under arrangements now approved, community action agencies normally act as contractors or grantees for Neighborhood Youth Corps projects, for projects under sections 205(d) and (e) of the Economic Opportunity Act, and for the special impact programs under part D of title I of that Act. It is expected that the same arrangements would govern the projects under the new part B.

Section 124 would also specifically require that there be arrangements governing the recruitment or selection of participants with a view to assuring that, as among the various programs authorized and other programs in the community designed to enhance or restore employability, each person is referred to the program which is most appropriate considering his needs and capabilities.

Section 125. Program Participants—Application of Federal Law: This section would apply to all programs under this part certain provisions similar to those now applicable to the Neighborhood Youth Corps. These would require participants to be permanent residents. They also provide that participants shall not be deemed Federal employees under various laws relating to Federal employment.

Section 126. General Conditions for Program Approval: This section would make applicable to all projects a number of general conditions which govern Neighborhood Youth Corps projects. These preclude employment on projects involving political parties or projects involving facilities for use for sectarian or religious worship; set forth requirements for the protection of employed workers and existing contracts of service; require that rates of pay and other conditions of employment must be appropriate and reasonable in light of various factors.

Section 127. Equitable Distribution of Assistance: This section provides for allotment of funds for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the community employment and training programs in accordance with the criteria for equitable distribution now in effect for the former program. It also provides that the Director shall reserve 25 percent of title I funds, for the new urban employment programs. No specific allotment criteria would be prescribed for those programs, but not more than 12½ percent of the funds reserved for them could be used in any fiscal year in any one State.

Section 128. Technical Assistance and Training: This section authorizes the Director to provide technical assistance or training for personnel where necessary for the effective operation of programs under the new part B. In use of this authority, special emphasis on the problems of rural areas would be required.

Section 129. Limitations on Federal Assistance: This section establishes a basic 90 percent ratio of Federal assistance for programs under the new part, similar to that now applicable to the Neighborhood Youth Corps. As in the present law, authority to establish a higher rate where necessary would be provided, and specific provision would be made to allow non-Federal contributions in the form of contributions of plant, equipment or services.

Section 129 also provides authority, similar to that now governing the Neighborhood Youth Corps, under which on-the-job training arrangements with private profit-making employers may cover payment of reasonable training costs but not wages paid to participants for services performed. It further requires the promulgation of regulations to assure with respect to all projects maintenance of adequate accounts, personnel systems and internal controls to promote the efficient and effective use of funds.

A further provision of this section limits financial assistance to projects sponsored by public or private nonprofit agencies, but would allow contracts with other private agencies in special cases where justified.

Section 130. Evaluation: This section requires that there be continuing evaluation of all programs under the new part B. In this respect, the Director would be authorized to contract for independent evaluations of particular programs or projects.

COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

Section 103 of the bill would generally revise the provisions of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act governing community action programs. As revised, title II would consist of a new statement of purpose and four parts. The first part would deal generally with community action programs and with community action agencies—what they are and what they are to do. The second would deal with financial assistance to locally de-

signed community action programs and related special programs, such as Head Start and Upward Bound. The third would deal with supplementary activities, such as technical assistance, training, research and pilot programs. The last would set forth requirements of general applicability, including responsibilities with respect to rural areas and coordination.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Section 201 states the purpose of community action. It is designed to set forth more specifically what community action is supposed to do; to permit a sharper delineation between community action and other programs which assist the poor; and to make clear the necessity for maintaining a balance among different objectives. It is, moreover, designed to operate as an integral part of the law. A community action program, as defined under the new title, must be designed to carry out all the purposes. A special or limited purpose program (such as Head Start, Upward Bound or Legal Services) must be designed to carry out those purposes just as fully as possible, subject only to the limits necessarily imposed because of the scope of the particular activities authorized.

The basic purpose of community action, as stated in this section, would be to promote the better focusing of available resources on the goal of helping the poor to obtain the knowledge, skills, motivations and opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient. The objective, therefore, would not be just to assist in meeting the needs of the poor. It would be, rather, to promote the use of a wide variety of resources in a way that will help the poor attain the capabilities required for them to overcome or avoid problems that now give rise to the need for assistance.

Section 201 also sets forth a number of specific purposes or objectives which the program is designed to promote as methods of achieving a better focusing of resources on the goal of family and individual self-sufficiency. These are: (1) to strengthen community capabilities for planning and coordinating Federal assistance so that through the efforts of local officials and private agencies and individuals, it may be made more responsive to local needs and conditions; (2) to support the better organization of services so that these may become more efficient and effective in helping poor individuals and families to deal simultaneously with a variety of interrelated problems; (3) to promote new types of services or innovative approaches needed for the increasingly effective use of available resources in attacking causes of poverty; (4) to assure maximum feasible participation of the poor and area residents in the development and implementation of programs; and (5) to promote the fuller use of private business, labor, and professional resources in connection with efforts to promote self-sufficiency.

The order of listing of specific purposes is not intended to indicate relative importance. And they may of course overlap. Yet each is to be regarded as essential. Under the bill, a community action program that focuses on only several, ignoring the rest, would not be operating in a manner consistent with what the law contemplates. Limited purpose programs would also be required to serve these purposes to the fullest extent possible, regardless of whether they are aimed at the young or old or are carried on in urban or rural areas.

Part A—Community action agencies and programs

This part would serve primarily to incorporate into law a variety of requirements relating to the structure and operation of community action agencies which do not now appear in the Economic Opportunity Act. It reflects the fact that, in something as complex as community action, the worth of

a local program is likely to be very largely dependent upon what kind of agency administers it, upon how responsive that agency is to the community as a whole rather than to just segments of the community, upon how it sees its responsibilities, and upon how efficiently and effectively, and very often, how tactfully, it operates. The new provisions are designed to establish a reasonably explicit set of requirements for these agencies and to provide, in the process, meaningful standards for measuring how well they perform.

Section 210. *Establishment of Community Action Agencies; Community Action Programs:* This section provides that a community action agency must be a public or private nonprofit agency which is both responsible for and capable of planning, coordinating, evaluating and administering a community action program. It then describes a community action program so as to require that such a program must provide or be designed to provide a sufficient range of services to have a potentially major impact on poverty, and that it must be structured to carry out all the purposes of the new title as described above.

Section 210 also indicates that the projects in a program for which a community action agency is responsible may include different kinds of components, assisted from different public or private sources. The direct administrative responsibilities of community action agencies for these projects must, however, be limited so as to be consistent with sound and efficient management.

This section also describes the nature of the "community" in which a community action agency may be established to carry on a community action program. It indicates that "communities" may parallel governmental units, or Indian reservations, or that they may be neighborhoods or other areas. The basic test established is that the unit or area must provide the organizational base and possess the commonality of interest needed for an effective and efficient program.

Section 211. *Structure of Community Action Agencies:* This section establishes the required structure for a community action agency. It makes clear the basic requirement—that the agency must be structured so as to assure continuing and effective community participation and program responsiveness to community needs and conditions. With respect to the governing board, section 211 retains the amendment added to the law last year under which one-third of the board must be poor. However, it also adds specific requirements that the board be organized so as to provide for membership of the chief elected official or officials or their representatives, as well as appropriate representatives of other major groups or interests in the community and representatives of agencies having functions related to the program.

Section 211 further indicates that governing boards must have the power to appoint persons to senior staff positions, determine major personnel, fiscal and program policies, assure compliance with conditions of assistance and approve applications for financial assistance. This would not preclude the establishment of neighborhood boards or committees with relatively broad functions with respect to particular groups of programs, so long as these remained subject to the powers of the board over the program as a whole. But the basic responsibility of the board for program control could not be shifted. Further, it should be noted that under subsequent provisions the agency must have rules adequate to assure full staff accountability to policies established by the board.

Section 212. *Powers and Functions of Community Action Agencies:* Subsection (a) of this section sets forth general requirements that a community action agency must be empowered to receive funds, not only

under title II, but also from other public or private sources in a position to provide assistance for activities of a community action program. It also requires that a community action agency be authorized to transfer funds and delegate powers, including funds for and powers over component projects whenever operation by another agency would contribute to efficiency and effectiveness or otherwise further objectives of the program.

Subsection (b) describes the minimum functions to be performed by community action agencies. These generally parallel the statement of purpose and are designed to provide a statement of the minimum agency activities which a balanced and effective program will require. Under this section, a community action agency would be expected to—

1. Plan for the program in a systematic way and evaluate its effectiveness, including actions to establish and reassess from time to time whatever priorities among projects, activities and areas are needed for the best and most efficient use of resources.

2. Cooperate with other agencies and public officials in efforts to improve local efforts to attack poverty, including efforts to improve day-to-day communication, close unnecessary gaps in services, and providing additional participation or employment opportunities for low-income individuals in community programs.

3. Initiate and sponsor new projects, responsive to needs of the poor that are not otherwise being met, with emphasis on such things as neighborhood centers that can be drawn upon by a variety of related programs and new approaches or kinds of services that can be incorporated into other programs.

4. Establish procedures, and provide opportunities, for participation of the poor and area residents, including activities to assist the poor and neighborhood groups to secure on their own behalf available assistance from public and private sources.

5. Promote participation by business, labor and other private groups and organizations that will result in the use of private resources and capabilities, with respect to such things as employment opportunities, investment of private funds, and arrangements for direct cooperation between business and other private organizations and neighborhood groups.

Section 213. *State and Regional Agencies:* This section is designed to extend the possibilities for operation of programs in rural or smaller communities by State or regional agencies where justified by considerations of efficiency and effectiveness. It would expressly permit a State or regional agency to be a community action agency for these purposes. A State or regional agency would, however, have to be structured and capable of operating in a manner consistent with the purposes of the requirements applicable generally to community action agencies, including the representation and participation requirements.

Section 214. *Administrative Standards:* This section sets forth administrative standards which each community action agency would have to observe in its own operations, require delegate agencies to observe, and encourage any other agencies participating in the program to follow. These standards are to assure that all program activities are not only consistent with community action purposes but that they are also conducted as effectively, efficiently, and as free of any taint of partisan, political bias or personal or family favoritism as is reasonably possible. Each agency would have to establish rules to implement these standards. These would include rules to assure full staff accountability, and conformity to the public information requirements now in the law. They would also have to include rules establishing specific standards for salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowances and other benefits,

rules to assure that employees are hired, retained and advanced according to standards of competence and integrity, and rules to guard against personal or financial conflicts of interests. Further, community action agencies would be required to establish appropriate limitations with respect to employee participation in picketing, protests and other "direct" action.

To assure effective implementation and reasonable uniformity in these standards, the Director would be required under subsection (a) to prescribe supplementary rules and regulations which would have to be observed in connection with all community action program activities assisted by him. He could, in these rules, establish special or simplified requirements for smaller community action agencies or agencies in rural areas, although not with respect to conflicts of interest, use of authority for partisan political purposes, or employee participation in direct action.

Section 215.—Evaluation: This section sets forth requirements for evaluating community action agency operations and program effectiveness. As with the present law, evidence of poverty and the probable capacity of the applicant agency to undertake what a community action program requires would be considered in connection with an initial grant. In addition, however, there would be more specific provisions covering the renewal or supplementation of assistance. For these purposes, the Director would consider the actual progress made in carrying out the required program, with due allowance for the special problems of smaller and rural communities, and the efficiency with which the community action agency has discharged its responsibilities. Specific standards for this evaluation would be required, which could take account of such things as the extent to which particular families or individuals have in fact been aided, the degree to which non-Federal funds have been provided over and above what the law requires, the extent of agency and individual participation, and the degree to which activities or approaches started in the program have been incorporated into other on-going programs in the community. The objective is an evaluation system that would regularly cover all community action agencies and that would be sufficiently specific to permit the shaping or conditioning of assistance in a way responsive to the problems and strengths of individual programs.

Under subsection (b), the Director would be specifically authorized to require community action agencies to secure independent evaluations. Where warranted, as in connection with community action agencies having especially difficult administrative problems, he could also require an agency to establish an independent group to provide advisory or evaluative services, either on a long-term or short-term basis.

Part B—Financial Assistance to Community Action Programs and Related Activities

This part provides for financial assistance to community action programs generally and to projects initiated pursuant to special programs, such as Head Start and Legal Services. The provisions in large part follow the present law, but there are some significant modifications. These are designed to distinguish more clearly between the different types of programs; to provide somewhat greater flexibility for the limited purpose programs with respect to such things as allotment of funds outside of the general formula; and to provide a statement of funding authority which more nearly reflects community action purposes and which takes account of relationships to other programs.

Section 220. Program Development: This section provides for assistance in developing community action programs. It expands the statement of authority in existing law so as to cover specifically assistance to agencies other than community action agencies and

to local governments for planning activities or organizational changes designed to support or improve the effectiveness of community action programs.

Section 221. General Financial Assistance: This section generally parallels existing section 205 of the law and provides authority for general, or so-called "versatile", assistance to community action programs. The language has, however, been modified so as to stress more accurately the objective of aiding components that are related, either directly or through combinations with other activities, to the objective of promoting individual and family self-sufficiency. Also, the revised authority would make clear that community action versatile funds are not to be regarded as a substitute for, or supplanting, other sources of assistance which may be available for funding proposed program activities.

Subsection (b) would retain existing authority for providing assistance to agencies other than community action agencies upon a showing of good cause. Subsection (c), consistent with current procedures, would specifically require that every applicant for assistance consult with local officials and interested agencies with a view of resolving issues of cooperation and possible duplication prior to submission of the application.

Section 222. Special Programs: This section provides for financial assistance to projects initiated pursuant to special programs, such as Project Head Start. The relatively broad authority provided by the original provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act has been used to create a variety of new programs, national in scope, each designed to deal with particular problems or facets of poverty. Several of these have now been specifically recognized in the law. A basic objective of this section is to provide a more explicit basis for this kind of innovative "national emphasis" program and, at the same time, to delineate more clearly their relationship to other community action authorities and activities.

Under subsection (a) the Director would be authorized to develop and carry on special programs to deal with particularly critical needs or problems of the poor which are common to a number of communities. He could use this authority only in connection with special programs involving activities which can be incorporated into or closely coordinated with local community action programs, and only where he determines that the program objective could not be obtained through the regular program of assistance to community action programs. Special programs would also have to be structured in a way that will, within the limits of the type of activity or assistance contemplated, most fully and effectively promote the purposes of title II. For example, a legal services program, because it is structured according to national standards, does not leave as much room for community planning of projects as exists in the case of projects receiving general community action assistance. It should, however, allow considerable latitude for local variations, and it plainly can and should provide ample leeway for implementation of various other community action purposes as well, including participation of the poor and area residents.

Special program projects may be local or regional in geographic scope, and assistance may be extended to any appropriate public or private nonprofit agency. The Director, however, would be required to encourage inclusion of projects in local community action programs with a view to minimizing possible duplication and promoting efficiency, better assisting individuals and families with diverse needs and generally promoting a focusing of resources on the promotion of individual and family self-sufficiency.

Section 222(a) also sets forth specifically a number of special programs which must be conducted. These include Head Start,

the Legal Services program and the Comprehensive Health Services program. These are set forth substantially as in the present law, except that the specific reference to narcotics programs has been deleted from the Health Services description and a provision has been added to the Legal Services description to assure maintenance of a confidential lawyer-client relationship between program attorneys and those they represent. Also, pursuant to subsection (c), each of these programs may include essential technical assistance, research and training directly related to program development and implementation. This latter feature is designed to enhance flexibility by reducing dependence of these programs upon general community action authorities and to provide a clearer picture of what each in fact involves.

In addition to Head Start, Legal Services and Comprehensive Health Centers, project Upward Bound would be designated as a statutory special program. This would be described as a program directed at young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary schooling, which is to provide these students, through cooperative arrangements between one or more secondary schools, with the skills and motivation needed for success in college.

It should be noted that the designation of specific programs is not intended to be exclusive. Programs, rather, have been specifically designated on the basis of size and their having been in operation over some period of time. One of the advantages of the present law is that programs may be started in a way that allows exceptional leeway for adjustments in design and approach on the basis of operating experience. This feature would be preserved. Accordingly, several major planned new programs have not been specifically described under this section but could be operated instead pursuant to the general authority this section provides. These include one program for expanding neighborhood centers to encompass a variety of childhood development services. Also, not specifically designated is a planned major program focused upon providing supplementary assistance to aid children in the primary grades to sustain the gains they have made in Head Start.

Under subsection (b) of this section, the Director would be required to give priority in developing new special programs to those which involve service or activities which have been tested in one or more community action programs or in other Federal, State or local programs, public or private. The special programs authority should, to the extent feasible, be available as a means of spreading innovative approaches initiated by local communities, as well as concepts which have been started on a small scale by Federal, State or local agencies. It is particularly important that the potential of these programs for supplementing other Federal or State programs be recognized. In some cases, they may be of a character where eventual incorporation into these programs is desirable. In order to take account of this, subsection (b) would specifically permit delegation of programs to other Federal agencies, or operation of programs by State or Federal agencies under suitable agreements. These provisions are supported by others, described under section 223 below, which would permit funds for special programs to be allotted separately among the States. This would facilitate operation of other agencies by eliminating the need for considering project approvals in terms of the availability of funds for community action programs generally within the several States.

Subsection (d) requires the Director to provide for the continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of all special programs. It also requires him to consult with other Federal agencies, or where appropriate with State agencies, with a view to providing for jointly

sponsored objective evaluation studies, on a national or State basis, wherever feasible.

Section 223. Allotment of Funds: Subsection (a) is the general provision governing allotment of community action funds among the several States. It is the same as the existing law (section 203), except for simplifications in wording.

Subsection (b) relates to allotment of funds for special programs, other than the comprehensive health center program which would be governed (as now) by its own provision. Subsection (b) would authorize the Director to allot funds for any of these programs separately from the general allotment. This would permit greater flexibility and facilitate operation of special programs through delegations or agreements. It is contemplated that in most cases any separate allotment would be made in accordance with the same statutory formula as that described in subsection (a). The Director would be permitted, however, to establish separate formulae where these would result in a more equitable distribution of funds in accordance with the relative incidence among the States of the problems or needs at which a particular program is directed. Such a formula, for example, might be applied in the case of a program designed to deal specifically with rural problems or problems of the elderly. In no event, however, could more than 12½ percent of the funds for any program be used in any year in any one State.

Subsections (c) and (d) relate to the Federal share and required maintenance of local effort. Except for technical clarifications, they are the same as existing law. The amendment made last year reducing the regular or basic Federal percentage from 90 to 80 is retained.

Part C—Supplemental Programs and Activities

Section 230. Technical Assistance and Training.—Authorizes the Director to provide technical assistance and training in connection with programs under title II. It is substantially identical to present section 206, with no substantive changes.

Section 231. State Agencies—generally expands the role of State agencies which, under present law, have been limited essentially to providing technical assistance to local communities. Many coordination problems related to the effective operation of anti-poverty programs require action at the State level. Moreover, many of the problems which are encountered in effecting this coordination in fact arise out of diverse requirements imposed in connection with different Federal programs or by different Federal agencies. State agencies are often in a good position to see the practical effects of these requirements, and they can, and should be encouraged to, assist in efforts to secure necessary modifications at the Federal level.

Section 231 accordingly would permit assistance to State agencies not only in connection with technical assistance but in support of activities to further coordination of State programs related to community action. It would extend the role of those agencies to include advising and assisting the Director in developing procedures and programs for greater State participation, and assisting the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council and heads of other Federal agencies in identifying and seeking methods of overcoming Federal statutory or administrative requirements that impede coordination of anti-poverty activities at the State level.

The role of the State agencies designated to perform these functions would be further strengthened by subsection (b) of this section. This would require the Director to give preference to programs which are administered or coordinated by such agencies, or which have been developed with their assistance, in connection with any grants or contracts with State agencies.

Section 232. Research and Pilot Programs—generally parallels existing research and demonstration authority (section 207 of the Economic Opportunity Act). It would, however, increase the limit on funds for this purpose from 5 to 10 percent of the amount appropriated or allocated for community action. The requirement that research be pursuant to an over-all plan would include any research activities undertaken in connection with special programs, such as Head Start or Upward Bound.

Part D—General and Technical Provisions

Section 240. Rural Areas—is designed to provide an express base for the contemplated general expansion of community action activities in rural areas. It is designed to make clear the responsibility for using all available authority for this purpose, including the authority to develop and carry on special programs that can be specially tailored to rural needs and problems, research and demonstration authority, and technical assistance authority. It would also require, wherever feasible, the development of special or simplified forms, guidelines, model components or model programs for use in rural areas.

This section would include existing provisions to assure an equitable distribution of funds among rural and urban areas, with one technical modification designed to remove from the law a non-poverty criterion—population according to the 1960 census—which tends to discriminate against rural communities. It also retains existing authority to provide financial assistance in rural areas to public or private non-profit agencies other than community action agencies whenever the Director determines that it is not feasible to establish a community action agency within a reasonable period of time.

A new provision is added by subsection (d) to encourage urban and rural communities to develop cooperative programs or projects, with particular emphasis on programs that may contribute to new employment opportunities or help in the development of common approaches to problems involved in the migration of low-income residents to urban areas.

Section 241. Coordination—Federal Agencies; Use of State Funds—is designed to promote better coordination of activities specifically related to community action, with particular emphasis on actions to help local communities to overcome day-to-day practical problems and methods of securing joint use of Federal and State controlled funds.

Subsection (a) states the general obligation of Federal agencies to exercise their powers, to the extent feasible, in support of community action objectives. It also provides specifically for joint or common efforts on the part of Federal agencies to assist local agencies in developing long-range plans, where justified by prior progress, or in developing methods to modify or better deal with diverse requirements attached to Federal assistance programs related to community action activities.

Subsection (b) is designed to take account of situations where two or more Federal agencies may jointly fund a project assisted under this title which is designed to, and can most efficiently function as a single unit. An example would be the Opportunities Industrialization Centers which have commonly received assistance from three Federal agencies—the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Because these Federal agencies have acted in concert in providing assistance, the local agencies have generally been enabled to undertake projects which would not have been possible otherwise. At the same time, however, each Federal agency attaches to its assistance a variety of administrative and technical requirements—relating to such matters as bonding, insurance, title to property, sub-contracting,

grantee personnel systems, salaries, and accounting—which more often than not are inconsistent with the conditions imposed by other agencies on the assistance they extend to the same grantee. There are, furthermore, commonly different matching requirements which may have the effect of locking up each part of the Federal assistance into separate boxes. And there is, further, the simple burden of dealing with two or more separate agencies, often with regional offices in different places, in connection with the great variety of matters that may come up in the course of initiating and administering what is planned as, and can best operate as, a single, unitary project.

This provision of the bill is designed to permit, within a framework of community action, a start to be made on a system of overcoming this kind of problem. It would authorize the President to promulgate regulations under which agencies could pool funds, designate a single agency to administer assistance, establish a single over-all local share requirement and agree upon a uniform set of technical or administrative requirements. The regulations would prescribe criteria for a unitary project, and would also define the type of technical or administrative requirement which agencies could waive in the interests of securing a uniform set of conditions. It is contemplated that waiver could extend to requirements imposed pursuant to statute. However, substantive program requirements, including such things as statutory allotment formula and requirements governing the type of eligible agency, could not be waived.

Subsection (c) is designed to encourage joint Federal-State funding of certain kinds of projects. For example, an adult education program or a model component in the field of adult education might involve the use of both Federal funds and State funds or funds under the control of a State agency. This section would permit the Director, in such a case, to designate the State agency as an agent of the United States to administer both the Federal and State portions of assistance to local agencies for the kind of project in question.

Section 242. Submission of Plans to Governors—duplicates, with no change, provisions of existing law providing for the submission of grants and other instruments of assistance to State governors.

Section 243. Fiscal Responsibility and Audit—expands provisions of existing law relating to audit and fiscal responsibility in the case of agencies receiving assistance under title II.

Subsection (a) and (b) restate existing law relating to maintenance of adequate accounting systems and preliminary audits. Subsection (c) adds specific requirements for further audits to be made at least annually of each grant or contract of assistance with a view to determining the allowability of expenditures. In the event of disallowance, it would authorize the Director to seek recovery by appropriate means which would include, in addition to court action, an increase commensurate with the disallowance of the required non-Federal share applicable to any grant or contract which is in effect with the agency affected or which is entered into with that agency within 12 months after the date of the disallowance.

Subsection (d) would further require controls to assure that the rate of expenditure of any agency receiving financial assistance does not exceed that contemplated under its approved program. In addition, it would require the Director to take action to promote fiscal coordination and continuity, as necessary for efficient grant administration, among activities or components of on-going community action programs.

Section 244. Special Limitations—sets forth various special limitations on the use of title II funds. These conform to provisions in the present law relating to payment of allowances and reimbursement for board

meetings; service of OEO employees on agency boards; a \$15,000 limit on salaries payable from Federal or matching funds; family planning conditions; general aid to elementary or secondary school systems; and use of existing schools, community centers and other facilities. The principal modification relates to the \$15,000 salary limit. This poses a particular problem in the case of programs or projects heavily dependent upon the services of professional or specialized personnel, such as doctors or lawyers, and may be unrealistic in given communities in view of disparities in prevailing salary levels. The bill would permit the Director, pursuant to regulations, to permit exceptions to cover such cases where application of the restriction would greatly impair program effectiveness or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

Note: The new title II would omit the Voluntary Assistance for Needy Children provisions of Part C of the current title II. It is believed that the type of program contemplated can better be carried out through the various child development and youth programs authorized under the Act, including Head Start, combined with the power of community action agencies and other sponsors to solicit and receive gifts locally and the general authority of the Director to receive gifts and contributions from any source or place and employ them in support of specific projects or in furtherance of the purposes of the Act. This approach assures that there will be a determination of needs of each child in relation to the needs of the whole family, tends to promote equity among children similarly situated, and provides an opportunity for supervising distribution and use of contributions received. It also avoids the possibility that hopes of children or their families will be falsely raised in expectation of assistance that may never be provided or that may be provided in quantity or quality different than hoped for, and tends to facilitate safeguards against the possibility that names of needy children or families may be made available to persons who might use them for purposes other than those intended.

Rural loan and migrant programs

Section 104 of the bill sets forth a number of technical amendments relating to the rural loan program and substantially revises the statutory provisions governing the migrant and seasonal agricultural worker program.

Subsection (a) includes only technical changes relating to the overall form of title III of the Act.

Subsection (b) modifies the title III statement of purpose. In the current Act section 301 is a general statement of purpose for all of title III. In the proposed amendments section 301 is included in part A (retitled "Rural Loan Program") and amended to apply specifically to the programs of rural loans for which that part provides. The amended section declares that the purpose of the loan program is to assist in raising and maintaining the income and living standards of low-income rural families.

Subsection (c) modifies the limit on family loans. Section 302 provides that loans may be made to a maximum "aggregate indebtedness" of \$3,500. The proposed amendments would change that limit to permit loans to be made to a maximum "aggregate principal indebtedness" of \$3,500, thereby excluding outstanding interest as part of the debt limit. This is essentially a technical change occasioned by the difficulty of determining the limit on a current basis so long as accrued interest must be taken into account.

Subsection (d) involves the Economic Opportunity Act revolving fund. The revolving fund formerly related to title III and the small business loan program authorized

under title IV. It was, accordingly, carried in the general provisions of title VI of the Act. The fund, however, now serves only the rural loan program, and this subsection would therefore transfer the section establishing the revolving fund to title III.

Subsection (e)—Migrant and Seasonally Employed Farm Workers. Subsection (e) substantially revises part B of title III of the Economic Opportunity Act as follows.

Section 311. Statement of Purpose: There is no statement of purpose in the current Act for the part providing aid to programs of assistance to migrant and other seasonally employed farm workers. The proposed amendments state that the purpose of such programs is to assist those workers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly complex and technological society.

Section 312. Financial Assistance: The current Act authorizes the development and implementation of a program of financial aid to States and local agencies and organizations focused on meeting the needs of migratory workers and seasonal farm workers in four specific categories: housing, sanitation, education and day care of children. In the proposed amendments those categories are replaced by provisions to expand the range of assistance to permit the comprehensive programs needed to fulfill the statement of purpose. They specifically provide for assistance to meet immediate needs such as day care for children, legal advice, consumer training, health services and education. In addition, however, they authorize assistance for efforts to increase community acceptance of the migrant or seasonal farm worker and his family, and efforts to equip him to meet the changing demands of agricultural employment and to avail himself of the opportunities to improve his family's well-being and self-sufficiency by gaining regular or permanent employment or by participating in other government training programs.

Section 313. Limitations on Assistance: This section requires an applicant agency or organization to maintain its prior level of effort in activities similar to those provided for in this part. It also requires coordination with other programs providing assistance to migrant or seasonally employed workers and their families.

Section 314. Technical Assistance, Training and Evaluation: Although technical assistance and help in providing trained personnel is often an urgent requirement for the success of programs of the type authorized in this part, no direct authority for such activities exists in the current Act. Such authority would be provided in this section of the proposed amendments. This section also requires evaluation of programs under this part and provides for independent evaluation studies where appropriate.

Administration and Coordination Amendments Administration

Additional Assistant Directors: Subsection (a) of section 105 of the bill would provide for two additional assistant directors.

The first of the new assistant directors would assume responsibility for the review and development of programs in rural areas. One objective is to assure that there is, within the Office of Economic Opportunity, a high level official who will be charged with a continuing and systematic effort to see that all authorities available to the Office are used in developing anti-poverty programs specifically designed for rural areas. Another is to assure that rural conditions and problems are taken into account in connection with all programs, whether or not they are specially designed for rural areas. Also, it is expected that the person designated would serve as a regular point of contact for rural communities and organizations

and would serve as a spokesman for rural interests in connection with day-to-day operations as well as major policy decisions.

The second new assistant director would be responsible for actions to promote improvements in the degree and extent of coordination among antipoverty programs. Other amendments contained in this section (described below) substantially revise the coordination provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act. Among other things, these amendments contemplate that the Economic Opportunity Council should play an increasingly active role in undertaking and supporting coordination activities, not only as among the Federal agencies themselves but also in connection with Federal-State-and-local relationships. The purpose of the additional position is to provide the Council with a chief executive officer who can act effectively in day-to-day matters on a level consistent with the high and complex responsibilities which the Council would be expected to assume.

Definitions. Subsection (b) of section 105 makes various technical and conforming changes in the section of the Act setting forth general definitions. Only one minor substantive change is effected. This involves the term "permanent resident" which appears in parts A and B of title I and limits eligibility for the Job Corps and new work-training programs. At present, persons admitted to the United States as parolees under designated provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act may be considered as permanent residents. The revised definition would permit certain conditional entrants to also be considered permanent residents.

Comparability of Wages. Subsection (c) of section 105 relates to section 610-1(a) of the present Act which requires that employees of Job Corps centers and community action programs be compensated at the average rates paid in the area to persons carrying out comparable services. The amendment would provide that the base for measuring comparability would be the average rate of compensation paid to "a substantial number of" persons employed in providing comparable services. This change is designed to simplify application of the comparability provision. Literally, the existing requirement may be considered to involve collection of a great mass of data in communities all over the country, some of which may either be unavailable or available only at disproportionate cost and effort. Under the amendment, information on wages or salaries could be accepted as adequate so long as it covered a substantial number of the persons engaged in providing comparable services. For example, in the case of teachers, the average could be determined on the basis of teachers in the public school system, without also collecting data covering teachers in what may be a large number of private schools in the community.

Transfer of funds. Subsection (d) amends section 616 of the Act which currently provides authority, notwithstanding appropriations limitations, to make limited transfers of funds among different titles of the Act. This authority, which is designed to afford a measure of flexibility in expanding programs (up to 10 percent) to take account of special or unforeseen needs, is at best an awkward device for situations where a need may arise for transfers within a title among programs for which funds may be separately appropriated. The amendment is designed to facilitate this latter kind of transfer by providing specifically for transfers among activities rather than titles. The same limits would apply as under the present section. Thus, funds for any activity could not, pursuant to this authority, be increased or decreased more than 10 percent above or below the level otherwise established.

Coordination

General. Subsection (e) of section 105 expands and revises existing provisions of title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act relating to the coordination of Federal antipoverty programs. One objective is to clarify and expand the role of the Economic Opportunity Council. At the present, the Council is established under provisions of the Act relating to administration and is charged, in very general terms, with advising and consulting with the Director in his performance of his functions. The amendments would focus the responsibilities of the Council specifically upon coordination, with new provisions to assure necessary staff support. The amendments would also clarify the responsibilities of the information center, revise the existing provisions relating to community action preference, and define various terms. Overall, the amendments are designed to emphasize the importance of an approach to coordination which includes Federal-State-local relationships as well as relationships among Federal agencies, and which concentrates to the extent feasible upon overcoming, and assisting local agencies and communities to overcome, specific, practical problems which impede effective and efficient program operation.

The above changes would be represented in new part B which would be added to title VI of the Act. The individual sections of that new part are described below.

Section 630. Statement of Purpose: Section 630 would set forth a statement of purpose for the coordination provisions. This would emphasize objectives of making programs more effective in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State and local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to local problems and conditions, stimulating combinations of resources in the solution of specific problems, and improving communication among all levels of government agencies and institutions in matters related to the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Section 631. Economic Opportunity Council: Under this section, the structure of the Council would be retained. The President, however, would be authorized to revise membership on the Council from time to time to take account of changes in functions or otherwise assure appropriate representation in furtherance of the purposes of the part.

Functions of the Council would be set forth in subsection (b). Under this subsection, the Council would advise the President and the Director. Its functions would include reviewing and making recommendations on major policy issues and questions of basic priorities involved in coordinating programs related to the Act. They would also include responsibility for initiating, and to the extent feasible arranging for the carrying out of, specific actions or projects designed to improve coordination among those programs. In addition, the Council would be responsible for providing general guidance and advice in connection with the information center.

It should also be noted that coordination responsibilities of the Council embrace review of the operation of section 634, relating to program and project combinations, which would replace the present community action preference provisions of the Act. Section 634 is described below.

Subsection (c) of this section provides specifically for Council staff, to be provided by the Director or by detail from time to time from other agencies. Subsection (d) provides for reports by the Council to the President and requires that a report covering the Council's activities shall be included in the Director's annual report or in a separate report for transmittal to the Congress.

Section 632. Responsibilities of the Director: This section sets forth certain specific responsibilities of the Director with respect to coordination. It would require the Di-

rector to carry on a continuing evaluation of all activities under the Act, and to consult with interested agencies and groups, including the State agencies now performing technical assistance functions, in order to identify specific coordination problems that may warrant consideration by the Council or the President, and whenever appropriate to institute action to overcome those problems. It would also charge the Director with undertaking studies of specific coordination problems, either on request of the President and the Council or on his own initiative.

Section 633. Cooperation of Federal Agencies: This section sets forth responsibilities of Federal agencies to cooperate with the Council and the Director. Except for specific recognition of the role of the Council, it is substantially similar to the provisions now contained in section 611(a) of the Act.

Section 634. Combination Among Projects and Programs: This section would replace existing section 612 of the Act. Section 612 provides generally that heads of Federal agencies shall, to the extent feasible, give a preference to applications which are made pursuant to or in connection with community action programs. Literally, this language tends to suggest a situation involving the processing of complete applications that may, in fact, have little relevance to what the "preference" provision was designed to accomplish. The objective is not to process one kind of application more speedily or more favorably than another but to encourage the combined or closely coordinated operation of what are in fact complementary activities or projects—those which are capable of reinforcing one another and operating more effectively and efficiently together than if each were carried on in isolation from the other. This objective, moreover, is not necessarily limited to coordination involving community action programs. A combination of resources and facilities is frequently both practicable and desirable among programs or projects designed to deal with problems of the poor, even in the absence of a community action program.

The new section 634 is designed to reflect this objective. It states Federal agency responsibilities in terms of encouraging appropriate combinations among related projects and activities rather than a preference limited to community action programs. Further, the Economic Opportunity Council would be specifically charged with carrying on a continuing review of the operation of this section. This would include identifying programs which may be especially appropriate for closely coordinated operation at the State or local level and evaluating and making recommendations concerning implementing procedures of the various Federal agencies.

Many of the concrete, practical problems of coordination may be approached through this section. One of the objectives of the new part is to stimulate more attention not only to the larger issues, such as consolidations of assistance programs, but also to details—such as technical requirements attached to different Federal programs, failures of communication among Federal, regional, State and local offices and agencies, and the kinds of information which must be provided to different local agencies if they are to be expected to engage in common planning and cooperative projects. The revision and broadening of the "preference" provision is designed to support an approach which pays greater attention to such problems.

Section 635. Information Center: This section sets forth provisions of the current law covering the information center, with one significant amendment. This would specifically authorize the Director, in connection with the operation of the center, to study ways of improving existing information systems, the adequacy of data, ways in

which data generated at the State or local level may be incorporated into Federal systems, and methods by which data may be made more readily available to State and local officials, agencies and organizations and used to further coordination objectives.

Section 636. Prohibition: This section restates, with no change, a provision in the current law that prohibits use of funds to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

Section 637. Special Responsibilities: Training Programs: This section restates a provision in current law setting forth certain responsibilities of the Director, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and other Federal agency heads with respect to the coordination of training programs. There is one technical modification. This is to delete the specific reference to the President's Committee on Manpower, which was created by Executive order rather than by statute, in favor of a more general reference to "mechanisms prescribed by the President."

Section 638. Definitions: This section defines the terms "programs related to this Act" and "coordination" as used in the new part. The definition of coordination is designed to focus upon four types of actions—actions to improve the common effectiveness of programs in reaching and serving the poor; actions to promote better use of Federal assistance under diverse programs at the State or local level; actions to promote simplification and efficiencies through the joint or combined use of Federal resources; and actions to improve communication and general cooperation. Examples are given under each of these categories, in order to emphasize the importance of specific, practical problems and the necessity for approaching coordination on a basis that allows for State and local participation.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VII

Section 106 of the bill provides for a substantial revision of title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Under existing law, beneficiaries of Economic Opportunity Act programs are entitled to have certain payments received under the Act disregarded for purposes of determining their welfare need. In essence, the welfare recipient may receive as much as \$85 a month in payments from the poverty program without any reduction in welfare benefits, and may receive additional amounts on the basis that welfare payments will be reduced by 50 cents for each additional dollar of payments under the poverty program. With respect to resident nonprofessionals, who serve in a mixed employment-training capacity, earnings in excess of \$150 per month result in loss of welfare on a dollar-for-dollar basis.

The revised title VII is designed to provide a more rational system for encouraging welfare recipients to participate in programs under the Economic Opportunity Act which are designed to enable them to become self-supporting. It provides a formula under which the receipt of money under Economic Opportunity programs always results in some reduction in welfare, but never on a dollar-for-dollar basis. The formula is also designed to provide for termination of public assistance when an individual achieves self-sufficiency.

Under the bill, payments received under the Economic Opportunity Act would be converted to a percentage of the beneficiary's "poverty line"—that is, the amount of income which represents the line between living in poverty and living out of poverty, as determined by the Director for purposes of administering the title. Welfare benefits to which the beneficiary would otherwise be entitled would be reduced by that percent-

age (or, at the option of the State, eight-tenths of that percentage).

The operation of this formula is illustrated by the following table:

Family of 5

[Assumed monthly poverty line, \$300; assumed monthly welfare if no earnings, \$150]

	A	B
Earnings.....	\$200	\$265
Proposed law:		
Earnings as a percent of poverty line.....	66.7	88.3
Reduction in welfare.....	\$100.00	\$132.50
Welfare payment.....	\$50.00	\$17.50
Total income (earnings plus welfare payment).....	\$250.00	\$282.50
Existing law:		
Earnings disregarded in determining need.....	\$117.50	\$117.50
Earnings taken into account (reduction in welfare).....	82.50	147.50
Welfare payment.....	67.50	2.50
Total income (earnings plus welfare payment).....	267.50	267.50

The table shows, for a family of five, the computations at two levels of earnings under the proposed revision of title VII and under existing law. For a family of five, the monthly poverty line is approximately \$300. It is assumed that the family's welfare entitlement, in the absence of earned income, would be \$150 monthly. On these assumptions, column A shows the welfare computations if the head of the house earns \$200 a month as a resident nonprofessional in a community action program, and column B shows the computations if earnings are \$265 a month.

In column A, the \$200 monthly earnings are 66.7% of the family's poverty line. Under the proposed formula, the welfare entitlement of \$150 is therefore reduced by 66.7%, or \$100. The family receives \$50 of welfare in addition to the \$200 earnings, for a total income of \$250 per month. This compares with a total income of \$267.50 under present law. In column B, with earnings of \$265, total income would be \$282.50 under the proposed formula, compared with \$267.50 under present law.

It will be noted that existing law provides no financial incentive for the family in the table to increase its earnings from \$200 a month to \$265. At either level, total family income is \$267.50. The existence of this kind of income plateau—where each additional dollar of earnings results in loss of a dollar of welfare—is a characteristic feature of welfare laws. The proposed formula, contrast, offers consistent incentives to increase earned income.

Enactment of the proposed title VII would be a first step toward designing incentives to encourage self-support. There is as yet little verifiable knowledge about the effectiveness of such incentives, and a primary purpose of the proposal is to facilitate research on this subject. Research into the effect of the revised title will provide the basis for making more sophisticated judgments in the future.

In making his determination of the poverty line, the Director will be guided by the Social Security Administration's index of poverty. However, in order to facilitate an analysis of the incentive effect of this experimental title, and to avoid unnecessary disruption of the administration of public assistance programs, he will not alter the poverty line initially established for the duration of the experiment.

In addition to this major change in direction, the proposed revision of title VII would bring its benefits for the first time to rural families receiving assistance under title III-A of the statute, and would clarify the applicability of the title to migrant families receiving assistance under title III-B.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VIII—VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

Section 107 of the bill amends title VIII. The major change is addition of a new part-time, "home town" volunteer program, although a variety of improvements to the existing VISTA program would also be incorporated. The new title VIII, as it would read with these amendments would consist of a statement of purpose and three parts, as described below.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Section 801 would revise the existing statement of purpose to reflect the addition of the new part-time volunteer program.

Part A—Full-Time Volunteer Programs

Section 810. *Authority to Establish Full-Time Programs:* This section continues, substantially unchanged, the provisions of the present law authorizing establishment of the VISTA program, including those relating to the terms and conditions of volunteer service, special restrictions on political activities, and the requirement that volunteers be assigned to duties in a State and that programs be operated therein only with the approval of the Governor of such State. The provisions concerning the assignment of volunteers to programs at the State or local level have been deleted, their implementation having proved to be infeasible. However, to the extent such provisions embodied the concept of encouraging participation of part-time volunteers in activities in their home communities, this concept has been reaffirmed in section 820 of the amendments.

Section 811. *Terms of Service:* This section incorporates in the Act, for the first time, provisions which clearly prescribe the commitment to be required of full-time volunteers. It provides that these persons must obligate themselves to serve full-time in combating poverty, living among and at the economic level of the people served. It also provides that, except when on authorized leave, they must remain on-call for service at all times without regard to regular working hours. These requirements have been incorporated in the Act, because experience has shown that full-time volunteers are most effective when totally immersed in the poverty environment.

This section also states as a positive requirement, the current VISTA policy that regular volunteers serve for periods of one year. However, it establishes as a permanent volunteer program, the short-term programs which have been conducted as special programs under section 805 of the existing law. These programs allow persons to serve as VISTA associates on a less than one year (but at least two-month) basis. They have been conducted until now as demonstrations and have proved both feasible and effective. It is believed, accordingly, that such programs should become an integral part of VISTA.

This section also continues the existing law's requirement that volunteers subscribe to an oath or affirmation to support and uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Section 812. *Support of Full-Time Volunteers:* As does the present law, the amended law provides for volunteer stipends at a rate not to exceed \$50 per month, or, in the case of volunteer leaders \$75 per month. It further specifically requires that volunteer leaders be selected from those volunteers who have developed and shown special skills during a year of volunteer service.

Subsection (b) of this section makes several clarifying changes in the Act. It would provide that, except in extraordinary circumstances, accrued stipends are not to be paid to a volunteer until completion of service. Moreover, it makes clear that in the event of the death of a volunteer during service, accrued stipend, as with accrued Job

Corps readjustment allowances, is to be paid to designated beneficiaries or survivors in accordance with provisions of law governing payment of money due to deceased Federal employees (5 U.S.C. 5583).

Subsection (c) of this section introduces authority which allows the Director to provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to utilize their VISTA experience in combating poverty after their formal connection with the program has ended. While the statement of purpose and legislative history of the existing law make it clear that encouraging volunteers to make continuing commitments to combating poverty is part of the purpose of VISTA, the existing law has no provision permitting expenditures for this purpose. Subsection (c), which is closely patterned on, although more restrictive than, section 5(d) of the Peace Corps Act, is included to remedy this shortcoming.

Part B—Auxiliary and Special Volunteer Programs

Section 820. *Community Service Programs:* This section authorizes the Director to encourage, develop and assist new programs designed to increase and expand volunteer participation. These programs will utilize volunteers working part-time, or for periods of less than two months' duration, in or near their home communities, in activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. They will be designed to encourage persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under the Economic Opportunity Act; in programs to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional or technical skills to contribute these skills to the betterment of neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations of poor; and in programs which assist existing national and local agencies and organizations to obtain services of volunteers more readily. It also authorizes the Director to provide specialized training for volunteers participating in such programs.

In this country there are many people who, while unable to volunteer full-time, or for long terms, are willing to contribute their skills and a portion of their time to provide meaningful service. Experience in carrying out the VISTA program illustrates some ways these persons can significantly enhance anti-poverty efforts by working part-time in their home communities. For example, two VISTA volunteers in Pittsburgh have organized a group of approximately 200 college students to tutor disadvantaged children. Similarly, volunteers working with the VESPREA program (Volunteers in Service to Puerto Rico), funded under section 805 of the present law, encourage qualified persons from the ranks of the poor to become part-time volunteers in their home communities in Puerto Rico.

But much broader efforts to increase volunteer participation are necessary and possible.

There are, for example, many business and professional men who have a little time and talents greatly needed; there are retired persons seeking creative outlets for their energies; there are people who, given the opportunity, would be prepared to give vacation time to some of the great variety of summer programs now being planned for low-income children and youth. Existing mechanisms for matching these people with the agencies, groups and organizations who need their services are commonly non-existent, deficient, or imperfect at best. This is particularly apt to be true of the many smaller agencies and programs which deal with the very poorest of the poor or which operate in the very heart of our slum areas. Moreover, there is often a need for giving volunteers short-term training which these agencies, acting individually, are unprepared to provide. Finally, there are frequently

organizations which could make greater use of volunteer assistance—or use it more effectively—given some technical assistance which is not now available, or given the help of one or more qualified individuals, including former VISTA volunteers, who have the experience needed to organize and oversee projects.

This section is designed to assist in overcoming these problems. It is expected that in many cases the projects authorized would operate in direct support of other programs under the Act, such as Head Start, and that they could serve in this respect to help meet some of the needs which these programs have for technical and professional skills. A particular effort would be made, where community action agencies exist, to encourage those agencies to develop their own capacities for more effectively organizing volunteer efforts and to incorporate projects for this purpose into those regular programs.

It should be noted that volunteers under this section would not receive any stipend, nor, except in unusual or special circumstances affecting their project, could they receive any other support or allowances. The section also provides that the value of the services of volunteers under this section, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, may be accepted toward provision of the non-Federal share.

Section 821. Special Volunteers Programs: This section retains existing authority for special demonstration projects, except for the existing VISTA associates short-term projects which would be incorporated into the regular VISTA program described under section 811. In view of this latter change, the limit on the portion of the title VIII funds which can be utilized for this section has been reduced from 15 to 10 percent. Also, administrative provisions have been transferred to section 832(b) of the proposed part C.

Part C—General Provisions

Section 831. Coordination with Other Programs: This section requires coordination of volunteer programs under this title with community action programs and with other appropriate Federal, State, local and national programs. It would require the Director to consult with other Federal, State, local and national agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this Act in order to encourage greater and more effective use of volunteer services in those programs. It would also require that the regular or full-time and part-time programs be carried out in a coordinated manner and that steps be taken accordingly to encourage former full-time volunteers to participate in part-time programs and to encourage part-time volunteers to enter full-time programs.

Section 832. Participation of Older Persons: This section would require the Director to take necessary steps, including the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest feasible participation of older persons in VISTA programs and activities.

Section 833. Application of Federal Law: This section retains the concept, expressed in existing law, that volunteers are not Federal employees and are not subject to the provisions of law relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits. As in the present law, the amendment makes partial exception for volunteers primarily responsible to, and supported and directed by VISTA. These volunteers are considered employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government for the purposes of the political activities ("Hatch Act") provisions of subchapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, and to be Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees in the Job Corps, except that for the purpose of computing work injury benefits the monthly

pay of a volunteer is deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title 5, United States Code.

Section 834. Special Limitations: This section provides that all support provided to volunteers under title VIII shall be furnished at the lowest possible cost; that volunteers shall not be used to displace employed workers, or impair existing contracts for services; and, that no agency utilizing volunteers may seek compensation for services performed by those volunteers.

TITLE II—SUMMER CAMP ACT OF 1967

This title of the bill is designed to carry out the President's recommendation in his February 8, 1967 message on Children and Youth for legislation to make additional summer camp opportunities available to needy children.

This title proposes a program under the general supervision of the Office of Economic Opportunity involving a partnership of the Federal Government with State and local governments and nonprofit organizations. With the funds it authorizes, the Federal Government would provide facilities on Federal lands, and, in agreement with State and local governments, on public lands under their administration. It also would establish a mechanism to make these facilities available to public and private nonprofit organizations which would agree to sponsor groups of children from low-income families and areas. It is anticipated that groups of about 100 children could be accommodated in camps for periods of two weeks.

While many nonprofit organizations now sponsor camps on a more-or-less regular basis, some of which are now located on public lands, the need for greater geographical distribution and the demand for facilities to accommodate the nation's youth requires greater utilization of recreational land. The following summary of this proposal shows how the President's recommendations on this subject would be implemented.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

Section 201. Short Title: This section provides that the provisions set forth in title II of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 governing the new program may be cited as the Summer Camp Act of 1967.

Section 202. Findings and Declaration of Purpose: This section finds that although millions of acres of forest and park lands throughout the nation are the property of all the people, those most in need, particularly disadvantaged children who would benefit from outdoor and camping experiences, are prevented by poverty from utilizing those lands. It declares a purpose of providing and assisting in the provision of camp facilities to permit greater use of public lands in behalf of these children.

Section 203. Basic Authority: This section authorizes the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to allocate funds to other Federal agencies, or extend financial assistance to State or local public agencies to provide camp facilities for use by disadvantaged children. Certain basic conditions are imposed which require that the facilities: (1) be located on public lands, (2) be so located in relation to population centers as to permit their best use in serving disadvantaged children, and (3) be provided and operated subject to a use plan giving reasonable assurance of their continued availability for these purposes under the sponsorship of one or more public or private nonprofit agencies.

Section 204. Allocation and Use of Funds: This section authorizes the Director to allocate funds to various Federal agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture, the Interior and the Army, to pay the cost of camp facilities on public lands under their

administration, and to provide funds by grant or contract to certain State or local public agencies for camp facilities. These funds may be used for (1) the construction, renovation or improvement (including furnishing and equipping) of camp facilities, (2) the purchase or lease of suitable privately owned facilities on public lands, and (3) essential maintenance and supervision of camp facilities. The use of such funds for the administration or operation of any camping program or project and for purchasing land would be specifically prohibited. This would not, however, preclude use of funds for acquiring necessary rights in connection with access roads, utility lines, or similar installations.

Section 205. Use Plans: This section sets forth requirements for use plans. The Director could not allocate funds to Federal agencies or extend assistance to any State or local agency, as provided for in section 204 of the Act, unless the facility or project is covered by such a plan or agreement approved by him.

In the case of Federal agencies, the use plan must contain such information and understandings concerning the character of the facility, the type and extent of use to be made of it, the number, nature of, and procedures for selecting sponsoring organizations, conformity with rules and regulations of the administering agency, and other matters as may be agreed upon by the Director and head of that agency. In the case of projects of State or local public bodies, the plan must contain, at a minimum, information and commitments assuring: (1) that the facilities will be adequate and reasonable in cost; (2) that their use will comply with applicable laws and regulations and be consistent with existing planning; (3) that they will remain available for an appropriate period and will not be converted to other use without the Director's approval; (4) that the agency seeking assistance will retain appropriate continuing control over the facilities; and (5) that satisfactory sponsoring agencies are available for operating or coordinating the operation of the facilities and that adequate methods or procedures exist for selecting those sponsoring agencies. In addition, the Director, after consultation with the heads of interested Federal agencies, is authorized to prescribe by regulation additional or supplementary requirements of criteria for use plans.

Section 206. Use of Facilities by Other Than the Disadvantaged: This section provides that groups other than disadvantaged children could use facilities provided or assisted under the Act only if the Director determined, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, (1) that the facilities would otherwise not be adequately utilized, and could not reasonably be expanded for use by disadvantaged children, and (2) that their use by other groups would not preclude or be inconsistent with their fullest practicable use for disadvantaged children. The regulations may provide for use by such other groups on a fee basis and may require that fees be applied in reducing the amount of financial assistance provided under the Act.

Section 207. Employment of Low-Income Persons: This section requires the Director, to the extent feasible, to encourage the provision and use of camp facilities in a manner that will promote employment and training opportunities for low-income individuals, including persons in the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other programs designed to restore employability.

Section 208. Limitation on Financial Assistance: This section limits financial assistance to State or local public agencies to 80 per cent of the approved cost of a project or activity. It also requires that the Director satisfy himself as to the maintenance of

preexisting levels of expenditures by these agencies in providing facilities for disadvantaged children.

Section 209. Labor Standards: This section incorporates provisions to assure compliance with the prevailing wage ("David-Bacon") requirements in the employment of laborers and mechanics in construction activity authorized by this Act.

Section 210. General Provisions: This section makes available to the Director the full administrative authority conferred upon him by section 602 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and in addition permits him to make arrangements with, reimburse, delegate powers to, heads of other Federal agencies, and authorize redelegations, without the approval of the President which is required in section 602(d) of that Act.

Section 211. Definitions: This section defines various terms such as "camp facilities," "State or local public agency," etc.

Section 212. Authorization: This section authorizes appropriation of \$20 million for the program for fiscal year 1968, and such sums as may be necessary for the two succeeding fiscal years. Sums so appropriated would remain available until expended.

TITLE III—CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

Title III of the bill would provide criminal penalties for the (a) embezzlement, willful misapplication, theft, or fraud of assistance funds provided under the Economic Opportunity Act by way of grant or contract, and (b) the use of duress to secure kickbacks from persons employed with funds provided under any such grant or contract. The penalty for embezzlement, willful misapplication, or theft would be a fine not to exceed \$10,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, unless the sum in question did not exceed \$100 in which case the maximum fine would be \$1,000 and the maximum imprisonment would be one year. Violation of the anti-kickback provision would be punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than one year.

There have been only a handful of cases of such misconduct in the two and one-half years since the Economic Opportunity Act became law, but a very few cases, if unpunished, can seriously endanger the system of good faith and confidence on which national assistance programs must depend. Moreover, the obvious interest of the Federal government in deterring such misconduct is essentially the same whenever it occurs. At present, however, unless there are specific false statements made by the actual culprit (see 18 U.S.C. 1001), prosecution must be sought under State law. The uncertainties and circumlocution of prosecuting a thief for false report of his theft, on the one hand, and the variations and extraneous considerations involved in relying on State prosecution, on the other hand, create a gap which title III would fill by providing for direct Federal jurisdiction over the misconduct.

SUMMARY OF THE BASIS AND GENERAL CONTENT OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

GENERAL

The Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 consist of a section authorizing fiscal year 1968 appropriations for various Economic Opportunity Act programs, and three titles. Only title I includes amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act itself. Title II would establish a program to aid in the provision of summer camp opportunities for disadvantaged children, pursuant to a recommendation of the President in his recent Message on Children and Youth. Title III would provide certain criminal sanctions to cover cases of embezzlement, willful misapplication, theft or kickbacks involving financial assistance funds under the Economic Opportunity Act.

AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2 of the bill would authorize appropriation of \$2.06 billion for programs under the Economic Opportunity Act for fiscal year 1968, including \$874 million for carrying out the Job Corps and work-training programs under title I of the Act, \$1.022 billion for community action programs under title II, \$47 million for the rural loan, and migrant and seasonal farm worker programs under title III, \$70 million for work-experience programs under title V, \$16 million for administration and coordination activities under title VI, and \$31 million for VISTA and volunteer programs under title VIII.

AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Title I includes a large number of amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. These are sufficiently numerous and comprehensive that—partly for technical reasons and partly for greater clarity—major parts of the Act, including Job Corps and Community Action, have been rewritten.

Although the amendments are substantial both in number and in anticipated over-all impact, they would not change the fundamental character of existing programs. To the contrary, they are predicated on the view that those programs are—and have proved themselves to be—sound and effective in basic concept. Yet no one would pretend that, today, the several programs are simply an extension of what they were in the beginning. They have, to some extent, developed along unanticipated paths; they have encountered some unforeseen problems. Policies once tentative, but of major importance, have been tested. And the experience, not only of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but of the State and local agencies, and many private groups that have participated in these programs is now sufficient to permit decisions governing long-run program direction that were not possible three years ago. Cumulatively, the adjustments suggested by these considerations add up to a law which will be in some respects less useful than the present Act for the processes of trying, testing and learning. But it will be a law which, while still retaining flexibility for needed innovation, is better suited to the complexities of effective and efficient administration.

Many of the amendments are technical. Some, such as provisions defining the structure and powers of community action boards,¹ are designed to deal with specific problems peculiar to a particular program. There are, however, several features which recur repeatedly. Among these are—

1. A better focusing of programs on the goal of helping people to help themselves to become self-sufficient. The Economic Opportunity Act represents a national commitment to the elimination of poverty. The needs of the poor are, however, so great and so extensive that it is frequently difficult to maintain a focus upon the causes of poverty as distinguished from its symptoms. Yet for Economic Opportunity Act programs that focus is critical. The bill undertakes to sharpen this focus in a number of ways. For example—

a. It contains a new employment program designed to reach thousands of unemployed or underemployed slum residents many of whom are at best only marginally employable, and to provide them, for the first time, with the kind of intensive help and support needed to enable them to secure and hold the substantial number of meaningful jobs that today exist or can be made available in many urban areas.²

b. It specifically directs the complex of activities represented by community action

to one over-all objective—the promotion of full family and individual self-sufficiency.³

c. It expands the concept of the migrant and seasonal agricultural worker program, currently stated in terms of assistance in meeting housing, sanitation, education and day care needs, to include the assistance required to help these workers and their families cope with technological changes which are cutting deeper and deeper into even their present inadequate livelihood.⁴

d. It revises the formula in the present law relating to the treatment under the welfare laws of persons in training or work-training, so as to provide—and test—a new system of incentives under which public assistance recipients would be encouraged not only to work but to push their earnings up to the point where they will get out of poverty.⁵

2. *Strengthening of fiscal and administrative controls and standards.* As Economic Opportunity Act programs mature, and as agencies responsible for those programs gain operating experience, they should be expected to meet increasingly high standards of efficiency and technical competence.

This objective holds true of all programs under the Act. The problems involved are, however, probably most complex in the case of community action. These local programs may include a wide range of projects and activities; they may involve numerous participating agencies; the community action agency itself is likely to be relatively new; and there are manifest difficulties in developing personnel systems which maintain necessary merit features without curtailing job opportunities for poor people who commonly lack the formal education and training required to satisfy traditional job entrance and promotion requirements. Yet for all these complications, it is clear that if community action agencies are to perform effectively, and measure up to their responsibilities, they must aim for administrative standards which are not only adequate but if possible distinctly above those generally acceptable in the community.

The bill includes a substantial number of amendments which are basically designed to improve or tighten administrative standards consistent with the needs and growing technical capabilities of the several programs. These range from specific evaluation requirements which the bill would attach to the Job Corps, work-training, and community action and migrant programs,⁶ to limitations on Job Corps enrollee allowances and the addition to VISTA and the newly authorized part-time volunteer program of safeguards to assure that fees are not charged for volunteer services and that volunteers do not displace employed workers.⁷

In the case of community action, the bill includes an expanded audit and fiscal responsibility provision which would require annual operating audits, as well as the preliminary audits now prescribed; provide for the handling of audit disallowances; and require specific controls over the rate of local agency expenditures.⁸ The bill sets forth evaluation requirements, already mentioned above, which cover agency efficiency as well as program effectiveness, and which contemplate

¹ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 201.

² New title III-B (sec. 104(e) of the bill), secs. 311 and 312.

³ New title VII (sec. 106 of the bill).

⁴ New title I-A (sec. 101 of the bill), sec. 113(a); new title I-B (sec. 102 of the bill), sec. 130; new title II (sec. 103 of the bill), secs. 215 and 222(d); new title III-B (sec. 104(e) of the bill), sec. 314.

⁵ New title I-A (sec. 101 of the bill), sec. 109; new title VIII (sec. 107 of the bill), sec. 834. See also the criminal provisions in title III of the bill.

⁶ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 243 (c) and (d).

¹ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 211.

² New title I-B (sec. 102 of the bill), sec. 123.

appointment of committees which could be composed of business and professional men to advise agencies having particular problems.⁹ And it expands and focuses existing program criteria so as to establish for each community action agency a specific obligation to achieve and adhere to standards of organization, management and administration that will meet the objective of providing assistance efficiently and free of any taint of partisan political bias or personal and family favoritism. This obligation would be implemented through rules governing a variety of specific potential problem areas, including staff accountability; salaries, salary increases, travel and per diem allowance and other employee benefits; hiring, retention and promotion standards; personal and financial conflicts of interest; and partisan political activities.¹⁰

It should be noted that, in addition to provisions which directly prescribe administrative standards, the bill includes a variety of features which should help in eliminating red tape, bolstering administrative resources, particularly in rural areas, or otherwise facilitating greater efficiency in operations. Some of these are described below in connection with amendments relating to the delineation of program purposes, State participation, increased private involvement, and improved coordination.

3. *A clearer delineation of specific program objectives.* For all its apparent generality, the Economic Opportunity Act is in fact a complex enactment establishing a number of major programs which are themselves complex—complex in what they seek to do and in the number and variety of problems with which they must deal. There has been—invariably—debate over the precise paths these programs should follow. This is not undesirable to the extent it involves shaping a program to the realities of what *can* be done as opposed to theoretical and untested notions of what should be done. But unnecessary debate can confuse needlessly, impair effectiveness, result in undue delays and contribute to a kind of inefficiency which defies even the best organization chart.

A clearer spelling out of purposes can help minimize this kind of problem. As in the case of improved administration, the problem of program purpose is probably most obvious in the case of community action. For a good local community action program must involve not just one but a number of essential elements; it cannot be all this or that; it must maintain a balance. This is a characteristic easily lost sight of by people seeking, not unnaturally, easy or simple—and sometimes flatly inconsistent—solutions to very complicated problems. One of the objectives of the amendments is to make this characteristic—the need for balance—explicit in the law and, by so doing, to help local agencies to develop programs that will reflect with increasing precision all that the community action concept requires.¹¹

But the spelling out or refinement of purposes or basic program standards is not confined to the community action provisions of the bill. Many parts of the amendments, including for example Job Corps provisions specifying more precisely the group to be served and establishing criteria and objectives for center programs and center community relations¹², would be similarly characterized. They speak to and are designed to reflect programs which have now moved away from initial experimentation and are acquiring a structure which requires more attention to securing the maximum results from established policies than to what those policies should be.

4. *A greater emphasis on coordination as a means of assisting State and local agencies to overcome specific, practical barriers to more efficient operation.* The better coordination of all anti-poverty programs has been a basic objective of the Economic Opportunity Act. It is, however, probably too easy to view coordination as something which requires only a few, simple decisions by one or more Federal officials from which all kinds of good and desirable things follow with little additional effort. In practice, coordination is much more apt to involve continuing attention to a lot of hard details, generally uninteresting in themselves, but cumulatively capable of creating real barriers to efficient and cooperative efforts. These barriers are sometimes best seen—as their consequences may be most keenly felt—not by Federal agencies but by people at the State and local level who have ultimate responsibility for translating Federal laws and regulations into measurable and meaningful results.

The coordination and information center provisions of the bill are designed to give greater emphasis to a pragmatic approach that focuses upon the hard, if sometimes grimy, details, and upon the operating problems encountered by State and local agencies in trying to do things a little more effectively and efficiently in the midst of a complicated network of laws, rules, conditions, guidelines and instructions.¹³

In addition—

a. The Work-training provisions of the bill are designed to make it easier for localities to construct programs that pull together different authorities now scattered in different parts of the Act, without having to secure separate grants or contracts covering the different activities which a project fully responsive to local needs and opportunities may require.¹⁴

b. The bill contains a provision under which Federal agencies, pursuant to Presidential regulations, may waive and eliminate some of the maze of potentially inconsistent technical requirements with which a local agency may now be saddled when it seeks to put together a single project combining assistance from different Federal sources.¹⁵

c. The community action provisions of the bill include a specific provision designed to lay the basis for joint action by Federal agencies in helping local agencies engaged in community action programs to overcome problems arising out of diverse Federal requirements and to make longer range plans than are now generally possible.¹⁶

5. *An expanded role for States and State agencies.* In the development of Federal grant-in-aid programs, there has been a tendency to observe relatively rigid categories; some types of assistance are given only to the States, with no direct dealings between Federal and local agencies; other assistance, to an increasing degree, has been granted directly to local agencies, with no State involvement. Some recent legislation has tended to suggest a more flexible and potentially creative approach. The present Economic Opportunity Act, with its provision for Federally-assisted State technical assistance agencies to help local communities develop and administer programs, provides an example of this latter approach.

The bill undertakes to build upon this relatively small but significant base for a co-operative Federal-State-local relationship. It thus contains a number of provisions—particularly in community action—designed to expand the use of State resources and capabilities. These include specific provision for State-operated community action pro-

grams serving rural and smaller communities, for State agency operation of community action special purpose programs, for Federal-State evaluation projects, and for joint Federal-State funding of specific projects or programs as a means of promoting the better coordination in the use of Federal community action and State funds.¹⁷ The bill also is designed to make it possible for State technical assistance agencies to play a broader role at the State level than the law now contemplates.¹⁸ Further, it contains provisions designed to afford States a more explicit role in the Job Corps¹⁹ and to invite their help in Federal coordination efforts.²⁰

6. *An expansion of programs in rural areas.* The bill contains a number of provisions designed to stimulate, facilitate and support the expansion of programs in rural areas. This is one of the objectives sought to be attained through the greater participation of States and State agencies, as described above. An expansion of rural areas programs is also one of the major uses to be made of the additional fiscal year 1968 funds which the bill would authorize—a need which is particularly crucial in view of the impact of reductions in funding for the current year on communities which had not started or only just initiated programs.

The bill further contains provisions designed to focus existing community action authorities more effectively on rural problems; and to encourage the development of joint or common community action projects between urban and rural communities.²¹ It seeks to channel technical assistance efforts under the several work-training programs so that they will be particularly helpful to rural communities in developing meaningful projects taking full advantage of the more flexible authority the bill would provide.²² It would, in addition, provide for an assistant director of the Office of Economic Opportunity who would be charged with responsibility for seeing that rural problems are taken into account in all programs and for developing new programs, procedures and approaches wherever necessary.²³

7. *An increase in opportunities for, and efforts to secure, private individual and organization participation.* A striking—and in its scope, novel—characteristic of the Economic Opportunity Act is its reliance upon private as well as public effort and resources. The Act reflects, in this respect, two facts: the problem of poverty is so large and pressing that its solution requires resources well beyond what public agencies alone can command; and, in the economy of this nation, people who ultimately escape poverty and gain self-sufficiency will do so in most cases through employment which only the private sector can provide.

The bill seeks to provide a basis for expanding private participation still further in a way that takes account of both of these facts. It would, for example, authorize a new urban employment program, specifically designed to operate with an unusual measure of private employer cooperation.²⁴ It would also expand the possibilities for including on-the-job training elements involving private employers in other work-train-

¹⁷ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), secs. 213, 222(b), 222(d), and 241(c).

¹⁸ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 231.

¹⁹ New title I-A (sec. 101 of the bill), sec. 115.

²⁰ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 231; new title VI-B (sec. 105(e) of the bill), sec. 632(2).

²¹ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 240.

²² New title I-B (sec. 102 of the bill), sec. 128.

²³ Sec. 105(a) of the bill.

²⁴ New title I-B (sec. 102 of the bill), sec. 123.

⁹ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 215.

¹⁰ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 214.

¹¹ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 201; also, sec. 212(b) of that title.

¹² New title I-A (sec. 101 of the bill), secs. 103, 105, 108(a) and 111.

¹³ New title VI-B (sec. 105(e) of the bill).

¹⁴ New title I-B (sec. 102 of the bill), sec. 122.

¹⁵ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 241(b).

¹⁶ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), sec. 241(a).

ing programs.²⁵ In the case of community action, it would specifically recognize the necessity for involving private business, labor and professional groups, not just through community action agency board membership, but also through projects using the capabilities of these groups in activities to help the poor obtain jobs or to make managerial and technical expertise more readily available to neighborhood groups.²⁶

Finally, the bill contemplates a large increase in private individual citizen participation—in connection with Head Start and child development programs and in a variety of other activities where there is a critical need for the talents and energies of dedicated people. It would, for this purpose authorize a new part-time volunteer program designed to extend to many thousands of people, young and old alike, opportunities for meaningful and rewarding service in helping the poor to help themselves—opportunities which VISTA, with its requirement for full-time service, can today offer only to a relative few.²⁷

ELECTION REFORM—THREE-BILL PACKAGE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, three bills dealing with the subject of clean elections, reform election finances, and arrangements under which free radio and television time might be furnished candidates for Federal, State and, where feasible, local office.

Mr. President, the introduction of these three bills is intended to follow up on the action of the Senate yesterday in adopting the Gore amendment, which would repeal the Long provisions for financing presidential campaigns by a cumbersome method of having individual taxpayers check off on their tax returns for contributions to be made to the national committees and under certain rather open restrictions to third political parties.

These three bills are:

The Election Reform Act of 1967, which I assume will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. It is essentially an improved version of the administration's election reform bill which I introduced last year. It has been strengthened by the addition of a stiffer enforcement section, which gives the Comptroller General the duty of checking election finance statements and reporting violations to the Attorney General. It would also authorize the Comptroller General to set up an automatic information retrieval system to handle campaign data.

In addition, this new election reform bill contains a requirement for mandatory comprehensive financial disclosure by Members of Congress and their key staff aids. The President's bill of last year took a small first step in the right direction by requiring Senators and Representatives to disclose gifts over \$100 and income from personal services. My present bill carries the process several

steps further by requiring the disclosure of assets, liabilities, capital gains, all forms of income, and business and professional associations.

Mr. President, the second bill is the Fair Campaign Finance Act of 1967, and I assume it will be referred to the Committee on Finance. It is a hybrid proposal, incorporating the best features of the report of President Kennedy's Commission on Campaign Costs, chaired by Alexander Heard, and President Johnson's recommendations to the Congress last year. The bill would create a tax credit for one-half of the total political contributions made to candidates for any Federal, State, or local elective office in a general or primary election, up to a maximum credit of \$20 per individual taxpayer. A husband and wife filing a joint return could claim up to \$40. This new tax incentive plan would be a substitute for the tax checkoff law passed by the Congress in such haste, and with so little mature consideration, last year, the bill which we voted to repeal yesterday by a rollcall of 48 to 42 in the Senate.

My third bill is called the Fair Campaign Broadcasting Act of 1967, and I assume it will be sent to the Committee on Commerce. This bill contains a brief and simple congressional directive to the Federal Communications Commission to develop regulations, after appropriate hearings, requiring every commercial television and radio licensee to make available to candidates for Federal, State, and where feasible, local office, free commercial broadcast time on a fair and equitable basis, as a condition to renewal of its license.

Despite the fact that the airwaves belong to the people, political candidates and their backers have had to ante up sums ranging into the tens of millions of dollars in election years to purchase the right to communicate with the people. Television expenditures in particular have become a major component in campaign costs. Their dramatic rise has produced a brutal squeeze on the candidate, putting him at the mercy of the "fat cats" who seek to use their campaign contributions to advance their special interests to the detriment of the public welfare.

There is no doubt in my mind that the FCC has the expertise and the resources to develop a fair and equitable system for apportioning free television and radio time along political candidates. It is certainly not unreasonable to require stations to comply with such a system as a part of their obligation to devote some of their broadcast time to the public interest.

If it be thought that such a provision for free television time would result in bankrupting the television stations, I wish to point out immediately that unquestionably they would raise their advertising rates.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these bills be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CLARK, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 1546. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 1547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an income tax credit for certain political contributions made by individuals, and to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1548. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for the furnishing to candidates for public office of free radio and television broadcast time on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Commerce.

LITTLE DELL PROJECT LEGISLATION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation to authorize construction of the Little Dell Dam and Reservoir project near Salt Lake City, Utah.

I should point out at the beginning the Department of the Army Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has this morning recommended authorization for the construction of the Little Dell Project dam and reservoir on Dell Creek for flood protection at Salt Lake City and for water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement.

This report now will go to the Chief of Engineers for further evaluation and for submission to the States and the other Federal agencies concerned. Thereafter the reports will go to the Secretary of the Army and the Bureau of the Budget.

As a means of voicing my approval of the project and the report, I am today introducing the authorizing legislation for Little Dell. I understand that when the other body next meets on Monday Utah's Representative from the district involved, Mr. LLOYD, also plans to introduce a similar bill.

I commend him for this action and I hope that between us we can see this long-awaited project become a reality.

I have been working on the Little Dell Project or variations of it ever since I first came to the Senate in an effort to help the city fathers in Salt Lake City control and harness the waters east of the metropolitan area.

Of course I was very pleased to hear the favorable report from the Corps of Engineers and I am hopeful that the next steps can be taken with dispatch so that we can start scheduling hearing and so that we can take the next legislative move.

Congressional authorization for the Little Dell Dam proposal was originally obtained with the addition of my earlier bill, S. 1045, as an amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1960. However, the Salt Lake City Commissioners, for several reasons, decided to reject the proposal, and the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City then called in an independent firm of consulting engineers, Berger and Associates of Salt Lake City, who conducted a study under the direction of E. O. Larson, former regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation in Salt Lake City, and submitted a report in December 1962. Whereas the original project was limited to flood control, the new proposal called for a comprehensive

²⁵ New title I-B (sec. 102 of the bill), sec. 122.

²⁶ New title II (sec. 103 of the bill), secs. 201(5), 211(a), 212(b)(5).

²⁷ New title VIII (sec. 107 of the bill), sec. 820.

water development and flood control plan.

In order to reauthorize the Little Dell project, a review investigation by the Army Corps of Engineers of the enlarged project was necessary, and such a review was authorized by the Senate Public Works Committee at my request in May of 1963. The Army Corps of Engineers Sacramento District has submitted its findings in a preliminary report dated December 10, 1964, which accepted almost intact the project as outlined by Berger Associates.

The proposal called for a combined Federal-District project to be built by the Corps of Engineers. It consisted of a 50,000-acre-foot multiple-purpose reservoir on Dell Creek, and the diversion of water to the reservoir from Emigration Creek; from Lambs Creek, a tributary of Parleys Creek; and from Mill Creek.

PROJECT BENEFITS

The water benefit of the project is, of course, most important, for the expanding Salt Lake metropolitan area. It is estimated that by conserving high water runoff and enabling more efficient water regulation, enough additional water will become available to supply another 100,000 population, which will assure an adequate water supply for 20 to 25 years, depending on the rate of population growth. At the present rate of growth in the area, the possibility of a water shortage by 1970 is very likely. Thus the need for early approval and construction of the Little Dell project is apparent.

The project's flood control and recreation proposals will also provide substantial benefits. The project will materially alleviate the flood hazard to Salt Lake City and to areas south of the city from damaging high flows originating on Emigration, Parleys, and Mill Creeks. Recreational value will be tremendous, particularly in view of the close proximity of the reservoir to the city and its nearness to Interstate 80.

Mr. President, I also should point out that when the hearings develop we will be given a chance to hear all interested parties and possibly to go over some of the cost figures and details of the project in more detail. As a layman I am not certain what sort of engineering problems will develop, however, I am fairly certain that the problems will be minor and that the corps and its experts will have the correct answers.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize the importance of speeding congressional and Corps of Engineers approval of the Little Dell project and I want to do everything possible to move it forward. I think the action today was a vital and welcomed step. I hope that the corps expedites its reports and gets them to Congress immediately after the necessary time period lapses. It is my hope that we have finally turned the corner of the project and that we can see some hope for approval.

The rapid increase in population and industrial development along the Wasatch Front and the apparent need for

more water to serve Salt Lake City within the next few years points up the importance of the project. The Little Dell project will be a great boon to the people of the Salt Lake metropolitan area.

Mr. President, so that the record can be complete and so that all of the facts can be at hand I would like to place into the RECORD, along with the bill, the public announcement from the Corps of Engineers, dated April 14, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and announcement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1549) to authorize construction of the Little Dell Dam and Reservoir project, Salt Lake City, Utah, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1549

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Little Dell Project for flood control and allied purposes on certain streams in the area of Salt Lake City, Utah, is authorized in accordance with the recommendations of the United States Army South Pacific division engineer in his report with respect to such project dated December 22, 1966, and a report dated April 14, 1967 from the Rivers and Harbors Board, Department of the Army, subject to such modifications as may be deemed advisable by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, at an estimated cost of \$23,000,000.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The announcement presented by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT RE LITTLE DELL PROJECT, SALT LAKE CITY STREAMS, UTAH

(By the Department of the Army, Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, Washington, D.C., April 14, 1967)

The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors has considered the report of the District Engineer, U.S. Army Engineer District, Sacramento, California, and the Division Engineer, U.S. Army Engineer Division, South Pacific, San Francisco, California, for improvement of Jordan River Basin, Salt Lake City Streams, Utah.

The Board concurs in general in the views and recommendations of the reporting officers. The proposed project is adequate for the planned purposes and is economically justified. The Board notes that existing State regulations pertaining to water supply reservoirs do not permit water contact sports. In view of this, the cost allocations have been revised to reflect a reduction in recreation benefits from \$835,000 to \$450,000 annually. The project first cost is reduced by \$250,000 and annual maintenance cost reduced by \$50,000 due to the lower level of recreation activity. In addition, the Board finds it necessary to increase the project first cost by \$2,750,000 as an added contingency should it become necessary to flatten the slopes of the dam and to modify the outlet works after more detailed study. These revisions result in a total project cost of \$23,000,000 and an annual maintenance, operation and replacements cost of \$122,000. The total annual benefits are \$1,475,000, the annual economic costs are \$951,000, and the revised benefit-cost ratio is 1.6. The revised cost allocation reflecting these changes is as follows:

	Allocated first cost
Flood control.....	\$6,490,000
Water supply.....	10,550,000
Recreation and fish and wildlife.....	5,960,000
Total	23,000,000

The Board notes that the major part of the flood damages prevented by the proposed project would occur in Salt Lake City, and are local in character; thus, the requirement of local cooperation specified by the Flood Control Act of 1936 for local protection projects should apply. With this addition, the Board concludes that the requirements of local cooperation are appropriate. The first cost to be paid by local interests would be \$10,550,000 for water supply, \$702,000 for flood control, and \$510,000 for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

The Board has also considered the advisability of adding multiple-draft water supply intakes in the reservoir to permit withdrawal of domestic water supply of highest quality. After preliminary review, it is believed the cost of adding such a structure would be relatively expensive due to the height of the dam, and probably would exceed the alternative cost of additional treatment at the Metropolitan Water District's treatment plant; this opinion is concurred in by the Metropolitan Water District. Accordingly, the Board believes that multiple-draft intakes should not be included at this time, but should be given further consideration in the preconstruction planning of the project.

Accordingly, the Board recommends that the authorized project for Jordan River Basin, Salt Lake City Streams, Utah, be modified to provide for construction of a dam and reservoir on Dell Creek for flood control, water supply, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement; all generally in accordance with the plan of the District Engineer and with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, at an estimated cost of \$23,000,000 for construction and \$122,000 annually for maintenance, operation, and replacements; Provided that, prior to initiation of construction, responsible local interests furnish assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army that they will:

a. Obtain without cost to the United States all water rights necessary for operation of the project in the interest of water supply;

b. Hold and save the United States free from damages due to water-rights claims resulting from construction and operation of the project;

c. Repay all costs allocated to water supply, as determined by the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the provisions of the Water Supply Act of 1958, as amended, presently estimated at \$10,550,000 for construction and \$17,000 annually for operation, maintenance, and replacements;

d. Maintain and operate the existing Mountain Dell Reservoir in accordance with flood control rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army;

e. In accordance with the Federal Water Project Recreation Act:

(1) Administer project land and water areas for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement;

(2) Pay, contribute in kind, or repay, which may be through user fees with interest, one-half of the separable cost allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, an amount currently estimated at \$510,000; and

(3) Bear all costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement of recreation and fish and wildlife lands and facilities, the amount involved being currently estimated at \$83,000 annually; and

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued September 13, 1967
For actions of September 12, 1967
90th-1st; No. 143

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....10	Holidays.....17	Small business loans....11
Calendar.....26	Job Corps.....18	Soybeans.....2
Cosponsors.....8	Labeling.....22	Taxation.....5
Cotton.....8	Legislative report....14	Textile imports.....21
Economy.....5	National park.....19	Tobacco tax.....13,22
Farm program.....20	Personnel.....3	Urban affairs.....16
Fish imports.....25	Poverty.....1,15,23	Water pollution.....7
Flood insurance.....27	REA.....9	Water resources.....12
Foreign trade.....6,8	Reclamation....4,24	

HIGHLIGHT: Senate committee reported poverty bill.

SENATE

1. **POVERTY.** The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments, which is a substitute for S. 1545, the original poverty bill (S. Rept. 563). p. S12809
Sen. Griffin inserted his "individual views" on the poverty bill in which he recommends several changes. pp. S12829-31
2. **SOYBEANS.** Sen. Mondale inserted a speech by Sen. McGovern on the outlook of soybeans and soybean products. pp. S12858-9

3. PERSONNEL. S. 1035, to protect the civilian employees of the executive branch of the Federal Government in the enjoyment to their constitutional rights and to prevent unwarranted governmental invasions of their privacy, was made the unfinished business, and the Acting Majority Leader said it is anticipated that action will be completed on this bill on Sept. 13. pp. S12877-80
4. RECLAMATION. Agreed to House amendment increasing authorizations for work on the Missouri River Basin project, S. 1601, which cleared this bill for the President. p. S12877
5. ECONOMY; TAXATION. Sen. Proxmire disagreed with the proposed tax increase and inserted an article on "Foggy Forecast: Tax Rise Debate Puts Spotlight on Inaccuracy of Economic Statistics.." pp. S12834-5
6. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Mondt inserted a Resolution by the American Legion urging Congress and the President to prohibit further trade with countries supplying North Vietnam. p. S12833
7. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Jackson inserted an editorial on the causes of water pollution in the Potomac River. p. S12828
8. COSPONSORS. Sen. Scott was added as a cosponsor to S. 1796, to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles, and Sens. Hollings, Talmadge, and Thurmond were added as cosponsors to S. 2127, to provide emergency assistance to first processors of cotton. pp. S12825-6
9. REA. Received from REA a report on the approval of a loan to a Tex. co-op for the financing of certain transmission and minor generation facilities; to Appropriations Committee. p. S12817

HOUSE

10. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to, 365-4, the conference report on H. R. 10738, the Defense appropriation bill. pp. H11675-94
11. SMALL-BUSINESS LOANS. Passed with amendments S. 1862, to increase by \$650 million the authorization for the SBA revolving fund and to extend from 10 to 15 years the maturity period for small-business facilities loans. pp. H11695-711
12. WATER RESOURCES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10130, to authorize the Interior Department to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments (H. Rept. 635). p. H11760
13. TOBACCO TAX. Rep. Tenzer inserted and discussed the program of the Cigarette Tax Enforcement Conference and the remarks of himself and Gov. Rockefeller. pp. H11745-8

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. LEGISLATIVE REPORT. Rep. Rumsfeld inserted the text of his report on legislation introduced and passed, and indicated whether or not he had approved or disapproved such legislation. pp. A4515-6

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS
OF 1967

REPORT

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC
WELFARE

UNITED STATES SENATE

ON

S. 2388

TO PROVIDE AN IMPROVED ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
ACT, TO AUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE CONTINUED OPERA-
TION OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS, TO AU-
THORIZE AN EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT, AND FOR
OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

INDIVIDUAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS



SEPTEMBER 12 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 11), 1967.—Ordered
to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OEO IS NECESSARY	3
III. COORDINATION	4
A. Findings.....	4
1. Background.....	4
2. Achievements in coordination.....	5
3. Shortcomings in coordination.....	6
B. Legislative recommendations.....	6
1. Federal coordination.....	6
2. State coordination.....	8
3. Local coordination.....	8
IV. JOB CORPS—TITLE I-A	9
A. Findings.....	9
1. Background.....	9
2. Enrollment.....	10
3. Recruitment.....	10
4. Who is served?.....	11
5. Achievement.....	12
6. Social contributions.....	12
7. Discipline.....	12
8. Community relations.....	12
9. Placement.....	13
10. Wages.....	13
11. Length of enrollment.....	13
12. Costs.....	14
13. Comparison of centers.....	14
14. Evaluation.....	15
B. Legislative recommendations.....	15
1. Capacity and funding level.....	15
2. Purpose.....	15
3. Eligibility, screening, and selection.....	15
4. Assignment.....	15
5. Centers and program activities.....	15
6. Allowances and support.....	16
7. Standards of conduct.....	16
8. Community participation.....	16
9. Counseling and job placement.....	17
10. Evaluation.....	17
11. Experimental projects.....	17
12. Participation of the States.....	17
13. Special limitations.....	17

	Page
V. WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS—TITLE I-B	18
A. Findings	18
1. Background	18
2. Neighborhood Youth Corps	18
(a) Purpose	18
(b) Funding level	18
(c) Sponsors and enrollment	19
(d) Who is served?	19
(e) In-school program	19
(f) Summer program	19
(g) Out-of-school program	19
(h) Costs	20
(i) Evaluation	20
3. Work experience and training program	21
(a) Purpose	21
(b) Funding level	21
(c) Enrollee characteristics	21
(d) Program content	21
(e) Placements	22
(f) Costs	22
(g) Administration	22
(h) Evaluation	23
4. Community employment and training program (Nelson amendment)	23
(a) Purpose	23
(b) Funding level	23
(c) Projects	23
(d) Participants	24
(e) Evaluation	24
5. New careers program (Scheuer amendment)	24
(a) Purpose	24
(b) Funding level	24
(c) Projects	24
(d) Participants	25
(e) Evaluation	25
6. Concentrated employment program	25
7. Other manpower services	25
(a) Community Action Program	25
(b) Manpower Development Training Act	26
(c) Employment Service	26
8. Summary of findings: Lack of a complete system	27
B. Legislative recommendations for work and training programs	28
1. Purpose	28
2. Prime sponsor	28
3. Comprehensive program	28
4. Delegate agencies	29
5. Eligible activities	29
6. Funding consolidation	30
7. Participants	31
8. Special conditions	31
9. Pilot projects	31
10. Fund allocation	31
11. Evaluation	31
VI. SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAM—TITLE I-D	32
A. Findings	32
B. Legislative recommendations	32
1. Purpose	32
2. Financial assistance	33
3. Eligible activities	33
4. Coordination	33
5. Business participation	34
6. Community participation	34

	Page
VII. COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM—TITLE II	34
A. Findings.....	34
1. Background.....	34
2. Overview of community action.....	35
(a) Program emphasis.....	35
(b) Resident participation.....	37
(c) Political activities and social protest.....	37
(d) Relationship to local government.....	38
(e) Delegate agencies.....	39
(f) Conclusion.....	39
3. Community action program components.....	39
(a) Headstart.....	39
(b) Legal services program.....	40
(c) Comprehensive health centers.....	40
(d) Upward Bound.....	41
4. Other CAP activities.....	42
(a) Neighborhood Centers.....	42
(b) Subprofessionals.....	42
(c) Remedial education and tutorial programs.....	43
(d) Adult basic education.....	43
(e) Project Enable.....	43
(f) Family planning.....	43
(g) Consumer action.....	43
(h) Older poor.....	44
(i) Rural programs.....	44
(j) Indians.....	44
B. Legislative recommendations.....	45
1. Purpose.....	45
2. Resident participation.....	45
3. Local initiative.....	47
4. Community action agencies.....	48
5. Communities.....	48
6. Statewide or regional agencies.....	49
7. Governing board.....	49
8. Powers of governing board.....	50
9. Delegate agencies.....	51
10. Financial assistance.....	52
11. Eligible activities.....	52
12. Systematic approach.....	53
13. Independent agencies.....	53
14. Federal review.....	53
15. National emphasis programs.....	54
(a) Headstart.....	54
(b) Follow Through.....	54
(c) Legal services.....	55
(d) Comprehensive health services.....	55
(e) Upward Bound.....	55
(f) Project Find.....	56
(g) Family planning.....	56
16. Resident employment.....	57
17. Neighborhood centers.....	57
18. Allotment of funds.....	57
19. Local matching.....	57
20. Technical assistance.....	58
21. Role of the States.....	58
22. Research and pilot projects.....	58
23. Evaluation.....	59
24. Rural areas.....	59
25. Fiscal responsibility.....	59
26. Audits.....	59
27. Special limitation.....	60
28. Educational services.....	60
VIII. RURAL LOAN PROGRAM—TITLE III-A	62
A. Findings.....	62
B. Legislative recommendations.....	62
IX. MIGRANT PROGRAM—TITLE III-B	63
A. Findings.....	63
1. Description.....	63
2. Evaluation.....	63
B. Legislative recommendations.....	64

	Page
X. SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM—TITLE IV	64
A. Findings.....	64
1. Small Business Development Centers.....	65
2. Economic opportunity loans.....	65
3. Evaluation.....	65
B. Legislative recommendations.....	66
1. Economic opportunity loans.....	66
2. Technical assistance and management training.....	66
XI. DAY CARE PROGRAM—TITLE V-B	67
A. Findings.....	67
B. Legislative recommendations.....	67
1. Purpose.....	67
2. Financial assistance.....	68
3. Participants.....	68
4. Training.....	68
XII. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING INCOME—TITLE VII	68
A. Findings.....	68
B. Legislative recommendations.....	69
XIII. VISTA—TITLE VIII	70
A. Findings.....	70
1. Purpose.....	70
2. Projects.....	70
3. Length of service.....	70
4. Selection.....	70
5. Training.....	71
6. Summer associates.....	71
7. Local volunteers.....	71
8. Foreign volunteers.....	71
9. Evaluation.....	72
B. Legislative recommendations.....	72
1. Full-time volunteers.....	72
2. Support.....	72
3. Community service programs.....	72
4. Special volunteers programs.....	73
5. Special demonstration.....	73
6. Coordination with other programs.....	73
7. Participation of older persons.....	73
XIV. EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM	74
A. Findings.....	74
B. Legislative recommendation.....	76
1. Purpose.....	76
2. Administration.....	76
3. Eligible areas.....	76
4. Program operators.....	77
5. Financial assistance.....	77
6. Local initiative.....	77
7. Requirements for local participation.....	78
8. Types of jobs.....	78
9. Occupational advancement.....	78
10. Private employment.....	79
11. Loans.....	79
12. Eligible participants.....	79
13. Special conditions.....	79
14. Reports.....	80
15. Authorizations.....	80
XV. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL	80
A. Title I—Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.....	80
B. Title II—Emergency Employment Act of 1967.....	107
XVI. CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW	109
XVII. MINORITY VIEWS	202
XVIII. SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF SENATOR PROUTY	206
XIX. SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF SENATORS DOMINICK AND FANNIN	213
XX. SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF SENATOR MURPHY	215
XXI. SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF SENATOR GRIFFIN	217

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

SEPTEMBER 12 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 11), 1967.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
submitted the following

REPORT

together with

INDIVIDUAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 2388]

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, having had under consideration legislation to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an emergency employment program, and for other purposes, reports an original bill and recommends that it do pass.

I. INTRODUCTION

On February 20, 1967, the Senate authorized the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to undertake a thorough examination of the war on poverty. Acting under this mandate, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty embarked upon an intensive study of the Economic Opportunity Act and related programs.

The subcommittee has conducted 33 days of public hearings in Washington and around the country, heard 401 witnesses in 144 hours of testimony, made 11 inspection trips in the field, received and considered 18 staff reports and 15 consultant reports, and held seven meetings in executive sessions. The hearings took the subcommittee to Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Wisconsin, Mississippi, New Mexico, and California as well as the District of Columbia. Consultants retained in each of the seven administrative regions of the Office of Economic Opportunity conducted case studies of 35 community action programs and seven State technical assistance agencies, involving a sample of programs in 26 States and the District of Columbia and including interviews with more than 1,000 persons. Six other consultants wrote special studies for the

committee, with particular concentration on statistical analyses of manpower programs. The product of the subcommittee's efforts is contained in 18 volumes of hearings and eight volumes of consultant and staff reports.

At this stage, the committee is ready to report on the first phase of its examination of the poverty program: how the present Economic Opportunity Act is working and what legislative changes should be made. This report, which accompanies S. 2388, therefore encompasses both the findings of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty and the committee's legislative recommendations as contained in the reported bill. All quotations are from subcommittee hearings.

A second and final report will deal in a more general way with the total array of Federal programs affecting the poor.

On the basis of its examination the committee has made the following general conclusions:

1. The magnitude of poverty in America continues to be a serious national problem and deserves continuing national attention. The United States has experienced steady progress in the reduction of poverty for 30 years and this progress has accelerated since the inception of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Nonetheless, the rate of improvement is far below the potential of an affluent society. Today nearly 30 million Americans are still poor.

2. The basic programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act are desirable and should be continued. However, the experience of the last 3 years has shown a number of ways in which administration can be improved and how the legislation can be strengthened. This report proposes a number of administrative improvements and the reported bill embodies the committee's legislative recommendations.

3. The Office of Economic Opportunity has been an essential national instrument for focusing attention on the problems of poverty, for serving as an advocate for the poor within the Federal Government, and for conducting and overseeing a number of useful programs. OEO should therefore continue in operation.

4. One of the major unsolved problems of the poverty program, though, is the lack of sufficient coordination among the wide variety of programs which serve the poor. This problem exists at the Federal, State, and local levels and between these levels. The reported bill contains a number of proposed remedies for these difficulties.

5. As desirable as these new programs are, the United States has not yet committed sufficient resources nor developed all the programs needed to eliminate poverty in the foreseeable future. During the second phase of its study, the subcommittee intends to examine more thoroughly what else is needed to do the total job. In the meantime, the committee is recommending the adoption of an Emergency Employment Act in order to make an immediate impact upon the lack of job opportunity in areas with severe concentrations of poverty and unemployment.

II. OEO IS NECESSARY

"Destruction of the OEO would turn out to be the destruction of the most ambitious, innovative, and imaginative program the Nation has ever undertaken to help the poor become self-sufficient."—Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League.

The committee, in its examination of the poverty program, has considered these questions: Is the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) necessary? Is it desirable to have a separate agency in the Executive Office of the President as the command post for the "war on poverty"? Or, should OEO be abolished and all its functions turned over to other Federal agencies? The committee's carefully considered answer is: Yes, OEO is necessary. It should not be abolished. Its programs should not be "spun off."

Because of OEO and the poverty program, this Nation has begun to come to grips with the tragic problem of poverty in the midst of affluence. OEO has placed poverty in the public spotlight. It has served as a rallying point for a broad spectrum of citizens who want to eliminate poverty—businessmen, labor union officials, religious leaders, State and local officials, social welfare professionals, minority group leaders, hundreds of thousands of plain citizens, and most of all, the poor themselves. OEO has served as an advocate for the needs of the poor within the halls of the Federal Government. It has been an experimenter, an originator of pilot projects, a designer of new programs which have potential for solving problems of poverty. If OEO were abolished, its unique contribution could not be duplicated by any other agency. Worst of all, the poor, whose hopes have been raised, would feel a deep sense of repudiation.

This is not merely the committee's viewpoint. It is the opinion of nearly every witness, both poor and nonpoor, who appeared before the committee at its hearings throughout the country. Of over 400 witnesses two advocated the abolition of OEO and the transfer of its functions to other agencies. Not one recommended termination of the programs of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Nevertheless, OEO's contribution to American life has not been without difficulties, and only recently has the agency begun to achieve sound internal management. OEO commenced operations with a feeling of great urgency to launch an all-out attack on poverty. It made its first grants in November 1964 only 6 weeks after the appropriation was approved, a remarkably short period, since most Federal agencies take 3 to 6 months and sometimes as long as a year to get a new program underway. Much of the early application review was done by senior staff, who made policy decisions as issues arose. This worked well for a while, but by the summer of 1965 the process was beginning to bog down. However, not until January 1966 was a joint management survey team of Federal officials assigned to develop a better organization and more effective procedures, and the 6-month delay in initiating these improvements is the source of some difficulties which still plague OEO. This team presented its report with 68 recommendations in June 1966, and by now virtually all of these have been put into effect.

In the intervening year, OEO has carried forward a process of administrative decentralization to seven regional offices. The com-

mittee, in its hearings and studies, has found that most of the current administrative difficulties come to focus in these regional offices. That, too, is being corrected. Based on a yearlong study by McKinsey & Co., Inc., OEO is reorganizing its regional offices and is instituting a series of uniform procedures which, if properly implemented, should remedy many of the difficulties.

In short, the committee has found that the administrative practices of OEO have shortcomings, but the committee is convinced that these can and are being remedied. As these defects are taken care of, OEO will be in a much better position to serve as the command post for the poverty program and to lead the way to achievement of the goal which President Johnson has held before the American people—the elimination of the scourge of poverty.

III. COORDINATION

“It is difficult enough to plan programs involving multiple funding sources but when a number of the Federal agencies do not plan together, it becomes almost impossible to plan and execute multiple funding projects.”—George Nicolau, commissioner, Community Development Agency, New York City.

A. FINDINGS

1. *Background*

When the President announced “unconditional war on poverty in the United States,” in January 1964, he defined that war in terms of the concerted use of all of the weapons at the Government’s command—all existing programs with an impact upon the problems of the poor, plus new programs to be enacted.

As the new programs—which became the Economic Opportunity Act—were developed, two organizational possibilities were available:

(1) They could be assigned to existing agencies, to be administered in coordination with existing programs related to the elimination of poverty.

(2) They could be assigned to the new agency which was being set up in the Executive Office of the President as the command post for the war on poverty—the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The former alternative was chosen for six of the 10 new programs: Neighborhood Youth Corps, college work-study, adult basic education, rural loans, small business loans, and work-experience and training. Except for work-experience and training, (which was assigned to HEW), statutory responsibility was placed in OEO but delegated by the Director to existing Federal agencies (and in the cases of college work-study and adult basic education later transferred by statute). The remaining four programs were assigned to OEO for direct operation, including the two that were most complex, innovative, far-reaching, and costly—the Job Corps and the community action program, as well as Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) and the migrants program.

While most of the Economic Opportunity Act dealt with the authorization of the 10 new programs, four sections were included to provide a statutory basis for OEO’s role as Government-wide coordinator of antipoverty efforts—sections 604, 611, 612, and 613.

These sections specifically charge the OEO Director with "coordination of antipoverty efforts by all segments of the Federal Government" (sec. 604); create a Cabinet-level Economic Opportunity Council, chaired by the Director, to assist him (sec. 604); empower the Director to obtain data and reports from other agencies regarding their antipoverty programs, and direct them to cooperate with him (sec. 611); authorize the Director to establish an information center on all Federal antipoverty programs and make information available to States and communities (sec. 613); and direct all agencies, within limits of feasibility and legal authority, to give preference to projects which are elements of approved community action programs (sec. 612).

At the community level, the community action agency was designed as a mechanism with a coordinating role analogous to that of OEO. The community action program would, in the language of existing law (sec. 202(a)(1)), "mobilize" and "utilize" public and private resources in the attack on poverty, as well as provide direct services.

2. Achievements in Coordination

Because OEO was assigned the formidable task of organizing new programs of unusual difficulty and sensitivity, the agency adopted a conscious strategy of dealing with coordination of other antipoverty programs only as that became necessary to the implementation of the programs for which it was responsible. Nevertheless, OEO does list a number of accomplishments in its capacity as coordinator. As examples:

- (1) It has reportedly developed for internal use only a national antipoverty plan, projecting for 5 years recommended funding levels for antipoverty programs throughout the Government and proposing new programs and program modifications.

- (2) It has stimulated and taken a leading part in discussions of basic questions of policy, such as income maintenance proposals.

- (3) Through technical assistance grants, it has provided each State with an agency, usually located in the Governor's office, which has the potential for dealing with a wide range of State and Federal-State functions.

- (4) Similarly, through grants to community action agencies, it has encouraged the formation of broadly based agencies which in many communities are contributing to the coordination of Federal assistance programs at the receiving end. It has negotiated "checkpoint" procedures with Labor, HUD, and agencies of HEW to assure that applications for aid under their programs are submitted for comment to community action agencies.

- (5) It has encouraged and funded projects, such as neighborhood centers, which have a special potential for mobilizing and coordinating community resources.

- (6) It has combined its funds with assistance from other agencies, such as the Department of Labor, to undertake joint projects.

- (7) It has established an information center with data, county by county, on 160 programs.

- (8) It has published a "Federal Catalog of Programs for the Improvement of the Community and the Individual," and in its information and training activities has sought to cover the whole range of Government antipoverty activities.

(9) The Economic Opportunity Council has organized multi-agency projects to deal with problems of displaced farmworkers in the Mississippi Delta, problems of Indians on reservations, and consumer programs.

3. Shortcomings in Coordination

In spite of these advances, there remain serious problems of coordination. Many of these show up not in Washington but at the local level where services are actually delivered. A constant theme of the subcommittee's field hearings and consultants' studies is the lack of effective coordination among Federal programs. For example Gov. John A. Volpe of Massachusetts observed that coordination is paramount among the problems that have made themselves apparent in the operation of the antipoverty programs. One of the committee's consultants documented the interagency difficulties of following through on the President's speech in Syracuse on August 19, 1966, calling for "the establishment in every ghetto in America of a neighborhood center to serve the people who live there." But not until June 1967 were any grants made, and these only for planning of pilot programs in 14 cities. The committee has itself experienced the frustrations of dealing with several agencies on a crucial problem as it has tried to stimulate the Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, and the Office of Economic Opportunity to respond quickly to the problem of hunger in America.

The coordinating instruments of the Economic Opportunity Act have helped but are too weak. Section 612, which requires other Federal programs to give preference to components of community action programs, has been found unworkable in any literal sense because community action agencies usually do not develop comprehensive programs embracing projects funded outside the Economic Opportunity Act and because other Federal agencies are generally not disposed to honor such preference. Even the preference provision for programs funded by the Economic Opportunity Act (sec. 211) has had little application, and OEO has substituted the checkpoint procedure to achieve the same objective.

The Economic Opportunity Council has been a useful forum for communications among Federal agencies and for discussion of some relatively minor problems of coordination on an ad hoc basis, but it has not served as an effective tool for concerted action with coordinated followthrough. In this respect, it has the same weaknesses as other interdepartmental committees of peers.

The committee is convinced that coordination is one of the major unsolved problems of the poverty program. Consequently, the committee's bill contains provisions to deal with this problem at the Federal, State, and local levels.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Federal Coordination

The committee bill completely rewrites part B of title VI, which deals with Federal coordination. It revises the Economic Opportunity Council (sec. 631) to provide the President a more versatile tool which he can use in assuring that Federal antipoverty efforts are well-coordinated, for ultimately only the Chief Executive has final jurisdic-

tion in resolving interdepartmental difficulties. The bill does not name any specific members of the Council other than the Director of OEO, but rather permits the President to designate whom he chooses from time to time and to appoint the Chairman. It gives the Council stronger powers, including the following ways in which it can assist the President:

- (1) provide for coordination of Federal programs and activities related to the Economic Opportunity Act;

- (2) develop basic policies and set priorities with respect to such programs and activities;

- (3) resolve differences arising among Federal departments and agencies with respect to such programs and activities; and

- (4) initiate and arrange for the carrying out of specific actions or projects designed to achieve the objectives of the act.

As important as these new powers is the creation of a full-time Executive Secretary with his own staff to serve the Council and to follow through on Council actions. He would be a level-2 executive, appointed by the President, similar in rank to the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

The bill contains additional provisions to achieve greater Federal coordination. It requires the Director of OEO to conduct continuing studies and evaluations, to identify problems of coordination, and to propose solutions (sec. 632). It requires Federal agencies to cooperate with the Council and the Director, and it authorizes the President to direct agencies to carry out programs and functions in conjunction with the poverty program (sec. 633). It encourages combinations of Federal projects and programs (sec. 634) and sets forth procedures for joint funding (sec. 612). It continues and expands the role of the Information Center (sec. 635). It retains a provision of the original act which prohibits duplication of functions (sec. 636), and it retains a previous amendment designed to achieve greater coordination of manpower training programs (sec. 637).

To give long-range perspective to coordinated Federal efforts to combat poverty, the bill requires the Director to prepare a 5-year national poverty action plan (sec. 632(3)). This plan should consider alternative periods of time in which poverty in America could be eliminated and should estimate Federal and other governmental expenditures and also contributions of the private sector necessary to achieve these alternative goals. This plan should encompass all Federal programs related to the elimination of poverty and should indicate what new programs might be necessary.

One other means of coordination—the use of delegation powers—remains unchanged from existing law (sec. 602(h)). Although the Director delegated six of the original 10 programs to other Federal agencies, the initial delegation orders contained no built-in controls which would assure coordination. However, new manpower programs, added last year (Nelson-Scheuer, and the Kennedy-Javits special impact programs), were delegated to the Department of Labor, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps was redelegated. This time the delegation instrument was broader in its scope and established a firm foundation for program coordination. One of the reasons the committee is opposed to the statutory transfer of programs from OEO to other agencies is that the delegation route offers a much higher potential for establishing an effective system of coordination.

2. State Coordination

The original act provided two roles for the States. The first was technical assistance, and all of the States established technical assistance agencies (although Indiana has since discontinued its agency). These agencies have been useful instruments in getting poverty programs started, especially in rural communities. The second role was the right of a Governor to disapprove projects, subject to an override by the Director for programs under titles I-B and II provided by a 1965 amendment. This veto has been used 15 times during the first 3 fiscal years of the act, and the Director's override has been used twice. In an unknown number of instances the threat of the Governor's veto has led to the modification of a local program.

The committee has concluded that the roles given the States are too limited. The Governor's veto is essentially a negative role, and technical assistance, while useful, does not go far enough. Yet, a few States, such as New Jersey and Massachusetts, have shown that the States can potentially make a significant contribution to the poverty program. This is especially true for the coordination of Federal programs which are channeled through State governments and for programs which the States themselves finance.

Therefore, the committee bill allows the Director to provide financial assistance to State agencies not only for technical assistance but also to assist in coordinating State activities related to the poverty program. It would be up to a State to embark upon such coordinating efforts, but OEO could help finance the operation. These functions could be carried out for both the community action program (sec. 231) and the work and training program (sec. 129). The bill also gives the States a role in advising the Director of OEO and the Economic Opportunity Council. It allows for joint funding of certain projects which combine State and Federal funds and retains the Governor's veto in the same form as existing law (secs. 114, 231, and 810).

3. Local Coordination

Program coordination is not an end in itself but only a means to an end. Coordination provides a means of dealing with complex, interconnected problems in their totality and of serving program participants as whole persons. In this perspective, the most important locale of coordination for the poverty program is at the community level where the poor live and work. Therefore, Federal and State programs must be organized to facilitate, not impede, local coordination.

The committee has concluded that the key to effective local coordination is the existence of a capable local agency with jurisdiction broad enough to deal with a variety of programs and with sufficient leverage to mobilize community resources. One of the best ways to obtain such leverage is through control over the allocation and expenditure of funds, such as those which come to the community under the Economic Opportunity Act.

This observation has led the committee to propose that the community action agency should be perceived as a prime sponsor for receiving and allocating community action funds (sec. 210). As prime sponsor it would not be expected to operate all programs directly but instead would channel funds to delegate agencies. But in determining what programs would be funded and by attaching conditions to the expenditure of funds, the community action agency would be

in a position to bring about coordination. This, in fact, is what the most effective community action agencies are already doing, and this approach should be extended. As a planning and coordinating body, the community action agency would be required to adopt a systematic approach to the implementation of programs and the utilization of funds (sec. 220 (b)).

However, as the planning and coordinating role of the community action agency is strengthened, it will be necessary to assure that the agency is broadly representative of the community and does not represent a narrow segment (sec. 213). Furthermore, it should be encouraged to use delegate agencies which would actually operate many of the programs (sec. 215). This role as prime sponsor would apply both to programs locally designed (sec. 220) and national emphasis programs, such as Headstart and legal services (sec. 221). However, the Director would have certain options to fund statewide or regional agencies to operate programs where community action agencies do not exist (sec. 212) or to fund independent agencies directly if it would better serve the purposes of the act (sec. 220(c)).

The committee bill would extend the concept of the prime sponsor to the work and training programs of part B of title I. Generally the prime sponsor would be the community action agency unless the Director determines that an alternative agency is likely to have greater capability (sec. 122(b)). As with the community action program, the work and training prime sponsor would be required to adopt a systematic approach (sec. 123(b)) and would be encouraged to use delegate agencies (sec. 122(d)). Here, too, the Director would have the option of using State agencies (sec. 129) or other independent agencies (sec. 123(c)) under certain circumstances.

IV. JOB CORPS

"I dropped out of school because my parents weren't able to support me and my father got too disabled to work, so I joined the Job Corps, looking for help in education and jobwise."—Roosevelt Edwards, Job Corps enrollee from Calhoun City, Miss.

A. FINDINGS

1. *Background*

The Job Corps was established by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 "to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship and to increase the employability of young men and women aged 16 through 21." The program was intended to serve those youths who are severely disadvantaged because of low educational achievement and little or no occupational skills and who need a change from their home environment. To achieve this purpose the Job Corps established residential centers which would provide intensive education, vocational training, work experience, health services, and other supportive services.

There are three types of centers: conservation centers, urban centers for men and women, and demonstration centers. Eighty-three conservation centers are currently being operated by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, six by various States, and one by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

There are 10 urban centers for men and 18 for women in operation under contract with private industry and nonprofit organizations. Five demonstration centers have been opened.

2. Enrollment

Since the first enrollee entered the Job Corps on January 6, 1965, 87,954 youth have been enrolled through June 30, 1967, including 42,032 active participants on that date. Their assignment to various types of centers compared to capacity is shown in table 1.

TABLE 1.—JOB CORPS ENROLLMENT AND CAPACITY, JUNE 30, 1967

	Centers	Enrollment	Capacity	Percent of capacity utilized
Total.....	123	42,032	42,614	98
Men.....	103	32,498	32,886	99
Conservation.....	90	16,046	15,736	102
Urban.....	10	16,177	16,600	97
Demonstration.....	¹ 3	275	550	50
Women.....	20	9,534	9,728	98
Urban.....	18	9,486	9,578	99
Demonstration.....	2	48	150	32

¹ The Washington, D.C. project operates separate facilities for boys and girls but is counted as a single project.

Source: Job Corps, Office of Economic Opportunity.

An understanding of the Job Corps operations, its successes and failures, and its unsolved problems can be gained by examining different phases from recruitment to placement.

3. Recruitment

According to the Job Corps, recruitment is performed by the following:

Agency:	Offices
U.S. Employment Service.....	1,470
Women in Community Service (WICS).....	272
Community action agencies.....	240
Neighborhood agencies.....	5
Urban Leagues.....	3
AFL-CIO Appalachians Council.....	30
Total.....	2,020
Voluntary referrals by—	
Urban League (cities).....	17
Police Athletic League (cities).....	4
YWCA (cities).....	27
State technical assistance panels of Department of Agriculture (States).....	23

Two recruitment problems have been reviewed by the committee. One is the difficulty during the past year in recruiting enough young women to fill the expanding women's program. This was solved by having the U.S. Employment Service supplement the work of WICS. The other is the need to improve the training of screening personnel so that they fully understand the purpose and nature of the Job Corps and give youth a realistic indication of what to expect. This is a continuing problem because of the farflung network of recruitment

agencies, all of which have other duties to perform and ever-changing personnel.

4. *Who is served?*

In order to select Job Corps recruits, the screeners see seven youths for each one who is referred and placed. Their aim is to refer only those who cannot be served by any other existing program but who are likely to benefit from enrollment in a residential center. Are they reaching those for whom the Job Corps is intended? Is the Job Corps serving hard-core youth? The answer is "Yes." As stated by the committee's consultant, Dr. Sar Levitan:

The record of the Job Corps is clear: it tried to attract youth who had difficulty finding employment even in a tight labor market. Two of every five enrollees in May 1967 had completed 8 years of education or less. And actual educational achievement was much lower than the formal education would indicate. Reading and arithmetic comprehension for half of the enrollees was at about the fifth grade level (or below). Nearly one of every three was unable to read a simple sentence or solve a second grade arithmetic problem. Two of every five came from a broken home, and two of every five from families on relief.

However, there are two trends in Job Corps enrollment which deserve attention. The first is that the average age of enrollees has gotten younger, and 56 percent were 16 and 17 years old during April-June 1967 compared to 45 percent during the first year of operation. This is due in part to the improvement in the economy with a tighter labor market which makes more jobs available for those 18 and older. But it makes the task of the Job Corps more difficult, for in comparison with older youth the 16- and 17-year-olds tend to be less motivated, they stay in the Job Corps a shorter time and fewer remain for graduation, and fewer find jobs after leaving because they are less prepared and because of age restrictions in certain occupations.

The second enrollment trend is the continued increase in the proportion of Negro and other nonwhite enrollees. During the first year of the Job Corps, whites constituted a majority of the enrollees, but by June 1967 Negroes constituted 54 percent; whites, including Spanish-speaking youth, 45 percent; and other races, 1 percent. Although minority youth have a higher rate of unemployment and proportionately more of them need the type of training the Job Corps provides, it would be unfortunate if the Job Corps centers were to reach a state of de facto segregation. However, in spite of this trend, intergroup relations are almost universally smooth within Job Corps centers at the same time that discontent is erupting in cities around the Nation.

Job Corps officials are aware of both of these problems. Since enrollment is influenced by alternative opportunities available to youth, the proportion of younger enrollees is likely to fluctuate with the economy, and the program at the centers must make necessary adjustments. The ethnic mixture can be affected by recruitment practices, and the Job Corps is fostering stronger recruitment efforts

in Appalachia and other areas with a high percentage of poor white youth.

5. Achievement

Youths who enroll in the Job Corps experience a significant gain in educational achievement and receive training useful for securing and holding employment. Data from the Job Corps indicate that for every 9 months of enrollment, the reading ability of enrollees is raised by an equivalent of 1.5 grades of school and arithmetic achievement by 1.8 grades. Vocational gains, while not as easily measured, include advancement through several levels of training. For data processing, for example, the steps would start with keypunch operation and advance to junior programing.

In addition, there are many intangible gains which are beyond measurement—improved motivation, greater self-esteem, more hopeful outlook on life, better personal and social adjustment, greater commitment to personal efforts to succeed. At a committee hearing at Camp Rodman in New Bedford, Mass., a Job Corpsman arose from the audience and said, "I came through these gates in January saying to myself that I will try it, and I hope I go through and then go out to work, but, you know, I find that with the education that I gained here, I am going to try to go on to college."

6. Social Contributions

In addition to personal achievements, Job Corps enrollees have made significant social contributions through the work they have performed. Information from the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture indicate that among their accomplishments are the following: 73 miles of firebreaks and fire suppression facilities built and maintained; 66 miles of fishing streams developed and maintained; 15,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat improvement; 2,300 miles of roads built and maintained; 7,936 acres of timber stands improved and reforested; 404 acres of watersheds restored; 10,251 units of picnic tables, fireplaces, cabins built; and 13,081 acres of trees and shrubs planted and areas landscaped in beautification projects.

7. Discipline

Discipline was a problem in the early days of the Job Corps, but as the centers gained more experience this has become a relatively minor problem. Members of the committee visited three centers—the Albuquerque Women's Center, Camp McCoy in Wisconsin, and Camp Rodman in Massachusetts—and discovered no major problems of discipline, and none was called to the committee's attention from elsewhere. At these centers youths were well groomed and seemed to get along very well.

8. Community Relations

Another problem in early days was community relations, but this too has been largely solved. All of the centers have established community advisory committees or other arrangements to work for better relations. Although each of three centers visited by the committee had community relations difficulties 6 to 9 months ago, these difficulties appear to have been worked out.

9. Placement

Based upon sample studies conducted for OEO by Louis Harris & Associates, the Job Corps estimates that 70 percent who have left the Job Corps are working, in the armed services, or enrolled in school. The remaining 30 percent were unemployed, out of the labor force (such as young women who married), or whereabouts unknown. Although adequate, controlled comparisons of Federal manpower programs are not possible, it would appear that the Job Corps' placement rate is somewhat comparable with MDTA institutional training (although the Job Corps reaches more disadvantaged persons) and is higher than the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Considering the types of youths served, 70 percent successful placement is a satisfactory record. However, many of the job placements are not in jobs for which the youth were trained, and there remain the 30 percent who are not in jobs, the school, or the military.

Responsibility for this shortcoming rests partly with the Job Corps, but it also relates to the lack of an effective manpower system in the United States. As will be discussed more fully in a later section, the committee's hearings and studies have uncovered strong evidence of fragmentation and discontinuity of services in the manpower field. It is not easy to go from one step to another without interruption. The Job Corps returnees are victims of this discontinuity, for there is no sure system which hooks them up with an effective placement mechanism in the communities where they locate. Deficiencies in the public employment service, in community based agencies, and in the practices of private employers are all factors to consider. It will take improvements in community manpower systems as well as in the Job Corps if the placement rate is to be higher.

10. Wages

The average hourly wage of former Job Corpsmen is \$1.58. This compares to \$1.19 for those who worked before entering the Job Corps. However, there is a significant difference in wages depending upon the length of time spent in the Job Corps, as shown in table 2.

Table 2.—Wages of former Job Corpsmen by length of time in Job Corps (as of May 1967)

Months in Job Corps:	Starting hourly wage
0-3.....	\$1.43
4-6.....	1.53
7-9.....	1.63
10-12.....	1.68
13-15.....	1.76
15 or more.....	1.79

Source: Job Corps, Office of Economic Opportunity.

These data must, however, be compared to information about youth who were accepted by the Job Corps but did not show up (who amount to three out of every 10 accepted). Louis Harris & Associates found that these "no-shows" averaged \$1.42 an hour, or about the same as those who had been in the Job Corps less than 3 months.

11. Length of Enrollment

This finding and other evidence suggest that an enrollment of at least 6 months is highly desirable, with 9 to 15 months being an

optimum period. Yet, a sample survey of enrollees who left the Job Corps in the fall of 1966 indicated that the median time spent in the centers was 4.3 months. Twenty-nine percent stayed longer than 6 months, and 34 percent left within 3 months. The older the youth, the longer he stayed in the Job Corps.

A stay of less than 3 months might produce some gain but not in proportion to the financial investment. Those who drop out within 30 days are very costly to the Job Corps and receive practically no benefit from the experience. Thus, a major task for the Job Corps is to devise ways to retain enrollees for longer period.

12. Costs.

During the first three fiscal years \$715 million have been allocated to the Job Corps for its operation. The direct operating cost per enrollee was \$6,900 for the 1967 fiscal year for the centers in operation 9 months or more, well under the \$7,500 required by a 1966 amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. In addition, overhead and capital costs each averaged \$600 per enrollee. The direct operating costs for men's urban centers averaged just under \$7,500; for women's centers, \$8,500, and for conservation centers, \$6,100 (not counting the cost of materials expended on conservation work, which was \$854 per conservation center enrollee). These costs are down from what they were a year ago, partly because of congressional pressure for economy and also because the centers are now operating at full capacity.

The committee has conferred with a number of the Job Corps contractors, including those from industrial firms which have had long experience in cost-cutting methods. They conclude that costs are reaching the rockbottom and cannot be further lowered without seriously impairing program quality. Center managers have expressed shock from learning the depth of disadvantage of the youths who enroll in the Job Corps. Remedial medical and dental services alone cost \$360 per enrollee. The seemingly high costs are necessary to remedy 16 to 20 years of neglect by local schools, health agencies, and other community service organizations and to overcome the handicaps of broken families and disruptive neighborhood life.

Indeed, costs are high, but needs are great. Yet, the committee is convinced that in the long run the Government will be fully reimbursed for these expenditures through the taxes derived from the corpsmen's subsequent greater earnings, not to speak of the savings to the welfare and correctional systems as these youngsters are assisted in finding productive roles in society.

13. Comparison of Centers

Data are just becoming available on the relative achievements of the various centers. The urban centers take youths with a higher educational level than the conservation centers, and higher levels of educational achievement, job placement, and wages all reflect these initial differences. One of the committee's consultants, Stephen Kurzman, has concluded that the urban centers operated by industrial firms generally do better than those operated by universities and other nonprofit agencies, but a notable exception is Camp Gary (operated by a nonprofit organization sponsored by the State of Texas, universities, and businesses), which he and Dr. Levitan regard as the best of the urban centers. Data on the conservation centers indicate a wide variation in educational achievement and dropout rates.

14. Evaluation

Although the Job Corps has the best data system of all the programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act, useful information is just now becoming available, and comparative data are still scarce. A far greater lack is a total system for the evaluation and comparison of all manpower programs financed by Federal funds.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon its studies, the committee has concluded that the Job Corps should be continued and retained as part of the Office of Economic Opportunity. However, the act should be amended to strengthen and tighten the Job Corps operation, based upon its two and a half years of experience.

1. Capacity and Funding Level

The enrollment capacity should be limited to 45,000 during the 1968 fiscal year (sec. 116(a)). This modest increase will enable the Job Corps to consolidate the gains made during the last year and concentrate its energies on improving some of the weaker centers and conducting demonstrations. This will require an appropriation of \$295 million. Consideration should be given to a further modest increase in enrollment capacity for the 1969 fiscal year.

2. Purpose

The committee bill makes it clear that the purpose of the Job Corps is to focus on low-income, disadvantaged young men and young women who need an intensive program in a group setting (sec. 101).

3. Eligibility, Screening, and Selection

Eligibility requirements are spelled out in greater detail to help keep the Job Corps on target (sec. 103). Arrangements for screening of applicants are more fully indicated than in existing law, with provision for screening through public and private nonprofit agencies (sec. 104). Potential enrollees must offer a reasonable expectation that they will be able to fit into the Job Corps (sec. 105). But the Job Corps should continue to serve the most disadvantaged, including juvenile delinquents who are judged by professionally qualified persons to merit a second chance. All pressures to serve only the "worthy poor" should be resisted.

4. Assignment

The basic enrollment and assignment requirements of existing law are kept except that, subject to an enrollee's needs, he is to be assigned to the closest center which has space (sec. 106). This modifies a 1966 amendment which requires placement in the nearest center in an enrollee's region even though the nearest center might be in an adjacent region. The requirement that at least 40 percent of all male enrollees be assigned to conservation centers is dropped in order to permit more flexibility in establishing demonstration centers.

5. Centers and Program Activities

Three types of centers are named: conservation, men's training, and women's training (sec. 107). The bill specifies more fully the type of program activities to be conducted, including education, vocational

training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation development, and counseling. Education and vocational training through local institutions is permitted, and procedures for obtaining high school equivalency certificates are specified (sec. 108).

6. Allowances and Support

Recognizing the need to establish incentives for staying at least 6 months in the Job Corps, the bill provides for personal allowances not to exceed \$35 a month during the first 6 months and \$65 a month thereafter except that the higher amount may be paid earlier to an enrollee who is expected to complete his training in less than 6 months. Personal allowances are to be graduated, based upon continued participation and achievement, and they may also be reduced as a disciplinary measure. As a further incentive, an enrollee may not receive his share of the readjustment allowance unless he remains for 6 months. However, that share he sends to dependents plus the matching contribution by the Job Corps will be paid from the beginning in recognition of the need to contribute to the financial support of his dependents. If he does not have a job at the time of graduation, he must go to the Employment Service office (or some other appropriate job placement agency) in the community to which he returns in order to pick up his readjustment check (sec. 109).

7. Standards of Conduct

The standards of conduct of existing law are kept, allowing center directors full disciplinary authority but providing for expeditious appeal procedures (sec. 110). The committee expects enrollees to be notified of their rights of appeal.

8. Community Participation

The bill requires the development of cooperative activities between the Job Corps centers and surrounding or nearby communities. One method could be community advisory councils which include participation of Job Corps enrollees and youths from the community. The Director is encouraged to establish other procedures to carry out the objective of better community relations, including such actions as the following: (1) giving community officials appropriate advance notice of changes in center rules, procedures, or activities that may affect the community; (2) affording the community a meaningful voice in center affairs of direct concern to it, including policies governing the issuance and terms of passes to enrollees; (3) providing center officials with full and rapid access to relevant community groups and agencies, including law enforcement agencies which work with young people in the community; (4) encouraging the fullest practicable participation of enrollees in programs or projects for community improvement or betterment, with adequate advance consultation with business, labor, professional, and other interested community groups and organizations; (5) arranging recreational, athletic, or similar events in which enrollees and local residents may participate together; (6) providing community residents with opportunities to work with enrollees directly, as part-time instructors, tutors, or advisers, either in the center or in the community; (7) developing, where feasible, job or career opportunities for enrollees in the community; and (8) promoting

interchanges of information and techniques among, and cooperative projects involving, the center and community schools, educational institutions, and agencies serving young people (sec. 111).

9. Counseling and Job Placement

The committee bill contains new provisions designed to achieve a better counseling and a more effective placement system for those who leave the Job Corps. The Job Corps should establish cooperative relationships with agencies which can provide placement services, especially the U.S. Employment Service. The Secretary of Labor, working cooperatively with the Employment Service and the Job Corps, should make arrangements to follow the progress of those who leave and to assist them to obtain further education and training as needed (sec. 112).

10. Evaluation

The committee has added a new provision requiring a systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program in order to measure the specific benefits and assess the effectiveness of program procedures. Such evaluation must provide for adequate control groups and for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the Job Corps. In particular, evaluative studies should follow up those who leave the Job Corps to determine their residence, employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life (sec. 113(a)).

11. Experimental Projects

The committee bill also provides for experimental projects designed to test new techniques. Among the projects shall be one or more testing the combination of residential and nonresidential facilities. The Director is also authorized to undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have the severest behavioral problems (sec. 109(b)). The Director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, is required to enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay the cost of establishing and operating model community vocational education schools and skill centers in urban areas; the object is to determine whether such schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem and whether such facilities could benefit the whole community (sec. 109(c)).

12. Participation of the States

The bill provides for consultation with State agencies on such matters as law enforcement, enrollee conduct and discipline, development of meaningful work experience, and coordination with State operated programs. The bill retains provisions of existing law to permit agreements with State agencies to operate programs and to give the Governor a veto (sec. 114).

13. Special Limitations

The bill raises the proportion of women required to be in the Job Corps from 23 to 25 percent. Maximum permitted operating costs for centers in operation more than 9 months are lowered from \$7,500 to \$7,300 (sec. 116). The prohibitions on political discrimination and political activity are unchanged from existing law (sec. 117).

V. WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

A. FINDINGS

1. Background

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 included two principal work and training programs which were intended to be carried out at the community level: Neighborhood Youth Corps (part B of title I) and work experience and training program (title V). In addition, the authority of the community action program (title II) was broad enough to permit manpower activities, and the hiring of subprofessionals by community action agencies created new jobs for the poor. Subsequently amendments have added other work and training programs. The Nelson amendment in 1965 established a special program for the chronically unemployed poor. In 1966 the Scheuer amendment set up a new careers program, and the Kennedy-Javits amendment provided funds for special impact programs in areas with especially large concentrations of low-income people. In addition, the Manpower Development and Training Act and the U.S. Employment Service through its local offices have been mobilized by communities as part of an overall approach to combating poverty.

All of these programs should be considered together to gain a sense of the total approach to work and training programs, and the committee's legislative recommendations would achieve consolidation of these fragmented efforts. But first let us consider our findings on each program separately.

2. Neighborhood Youth Corps

"I entered the Neighborhood Youth Corps because they say it would give you a chance to get up in the world. It would give you a chance to get a good job, and they give you good respect."—Lylian Washington, Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee in Johnstown, Pa.

(a) *Purpose*.—The Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) was established to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed young men and women * * * so that their employability may be increased and their education resumed or continued. The program also provides income to youths and their families. An unexpressed but subsidiary objective has been to reduce juvenile delinquency and the risk of riots by providing useful activities for unemployed youth.

(b) *Funding Level*.—The program was delegated by the Director of OEO to the Secretary of Labor. During its 2½ years of operations, \$773 million have been allocated to the Neighborhood Youth Corps. These funds have been assigned to three types of programs: inschool, summer, and out of school. The funding level during fiscal 1967 is shown in table 3.

Table 3.—Funding of Neighborhood Youth Corps, 1967 fiscal year

Program:	Funds (millions)
Inschool.....	\$68.3
Summer.....	85.8
Out of school.....	159.9
Administration.....	8.0
Research and demonstration.....	3.0
Total.....	325.0

Source: Neighborhood Youth Corps.

(c) *Sponsors and Enrollment.*—The sponsors of NYC projects have been distributed about equally among community action agencies, public schools, and other public and private nonprofit agencies. The trend is for greater use of community action agencies as sponsors with an increase from 20 percent in fiscal 1966 to 35 percent in the first half of 1967. The Neighborhood Youth Corps does not have an unduplicated count of youth served because many youth are enrolled in successive schools years and summers; but counting such duplications, over 900,000 have been reached in 3,340 local projects.

(d) *Who is Served?*—Analysis of enrollee characteristics indicates that the Neighborhood Youth Corps is serving those for whom it is intended. The typical enrollee comes from a large family (six persons) whose median income ranges between \$2,000 and \$3,000, and one of every four families is on public assistance. The average enrollee has completed 10 years of school; of the out-of-school enrollees one of every four has completed 8 years or less of school while one of every five has completed high school but was unemployed before entering the NYC. The enrollment trend indicates that the Neighborhood Youth Corps is serving a greater proportion of hard-core youth each year.

(e) *Inschool Program.*—The NYC inschool program is basically a work program supported by counseling, and most of the funds are used to pay enrollee wages. On the average, enrollees work 11 hours per week, and the bulk of work assignments is around the schools: clerical work, teachers' aides, library assistance, and various custodial chores. There are no national data on the results of the inschool NYC, but a few case studies by school systems have generally reported a lower dropout rate among NYC youths than among other students. For example, in Pittsburgh the dropout rate for NYC enrollees is 4.2, which is half of the 8.4 percent for the city as a whole. In the District of Columbia less than 2 percent of the NYC enrollees drop out in contrast to what the Board of Education cites as a normal dropout rate of 20 percent in the same schools. The school authorities attribute this difference to the financial assistance, encouragement, and counseling received by the students during the NYC experience.

(f) *Summer Program.*—The NYC summer programs, which reached over 150,000 youths in 1966, serve mostly those who attended school prior to enrolling—98 percent in 1966—and most of these return to school. Of the 2 percent who were dropouts, one-fourth returned to school. This summer 14- and 15-year-olds were enrolled for the first time under a 1966 amendment. Although summer enrollees receive relatively little counseling or remedial education, they have a chance to earn money and to make a contribution to their communities through beautification work, conduct of recreational programs, and other useful activities.

(g) *Out-of-School Program.*—The out-of-school NYC program serves those who have already dropped out of school and who are unemployed. Like the other two types of programs, enrollees generally receive \$1.25 an hour and perform useful community work. The majority of the girls is assigned to clerical and health work while the boys are most often assigned to maintenance, custodial, conservation, or beautification work. These assignments are made more to engender work habits than to teach vocational skills which will be useful for regular employment. Approximately 40 percent of the out-of-school

enrollees receive some type of remedial education, and one-fourth receive occupational training, mostly on the job. Recently NYC has implemented a 1966 amendment to provide job training opportunities in private industry.

The average period of enrollment in the out-of-school NYC is slightly less than 4 months, and no more than one-fifth stay as long as half a year. According to the Neighborhood Youth Corps, of the 12,500 who left during the fall of 1966, 31 percent took jobs, 2 percent entered the armed services, 20 percent returned to school, 2 percent joined the Job Corps, 1 percent enrolled in manpower development and training programs, 27 percent left for adjustment problems (poor attendance, dislike of staff or job content, could not get along), and 17 percent quit for other reasons or for whereabouts unknown. In sum, 56 percent had "successful" terminations. However, having previously dropped out of school and having received little occupational training in the NYC, these "graduates" were still not adequately trained for jobs with a future.

Another result of the out-of-school NYC is the reduction of juvenile delinquency. For example, a study in Cincinnati by Regis H. Walthers found that when compared to a control group NYC enrollees had more offenses before enrolling and fewer afterward.

(h) *Costs*.—The Federal cost for enrollee-term was as follows: in school, 9 months, \$650; summer, 2 months, \$520; out of school, 12 months, \$2,930. The Federal funds tend to be concentrated on wage payments and project administration with local sponsors supplying most of the funds for supervision. The costs of counseling, basic education, vocational training, and other supportive services are shared between the two sources, but these amount to a relatively small percentage of total costs: 4 percent for summer, 6 percent for out of school, and 7 percent for in school. Thus, the Neighborhood Youth Corps spends most of its funds for work with relatively little for training.

(i) *Evaluation*.—The committee has found many strengths in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. It is serving the hard-core, disadvantaged youth for whom it is intended. It provides a source of income for these youths from poor families. It helps prevent dropping out of school. It enables enrollees to perform useful community work. It contributes to the reduction of delinquency and the prevention of riots.

The main weaknesses show up in the out-of-school program, in large measure because it serves youths who tend to be more severely disadvantaged than their inschool counterparts. The period of enrollment is too short and the educational and training input is too meager to provide significant preparation for occupational advancement. The placement rate, while an improvement over participants' previous status, is well below the Job Corps and MDTA. Very few leave the NYC for further training under MDTA, which would appear to be a logical progression. In short, the committee believes that more stress should be placed on the quality of training for the out-of-school NYC even though this might raise significantly the cost per enrollee and reduce the total number who could be served. In this case, quality should come ahead of quantity.

Finally, the committee has found a regrettable lack of program information on the Neighborhood Youth Corps and a serious shortage of completed evaluative studies. However, this shortcoming is in the

process of being remedied, for a nationwide program data system is being put into operation and a number of independent evaluations are underway.

3. *Work Experience and Training Program.*

"It is highly significant that many of the persons successfully trained under title V are people who have been clients of public welfare for some time but were not helped until the advent of title V. Title V placed new resources—specially trained personnel—added financial incentives at the disposal of the welfare department."—Rt. Rev. Joseph T. Alves, Family Counseling and Guidance Center, Inc., Boston, Mass.

(a) *Purpose.*—The work experience and training program was enacted under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act to expand the opportunities for constructive work experience and other needed training available to persons who are unable to support or care for themselves or their families. It was to be aimed at unemployed fathers and other needy persons. The program was built upon the experience of the community work and training program, which had been established under the Social Security Amendments of 1962 and which by 1964 was operating in 10 States. Like its predecessor, the work experience and training program has been administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has assigned the program to the Welfare Administration and the State welfare departments.

(b) *Funding level.*—During its 2½ years of operations, \$324 million have been allocated to the work experience and training program under the Economic Opportunity Act. An additional but unknown amount has been spent under the regular public assistance program to benefit enrollees. Every State except Alabama has set up projects. As of June 30, 1967, 53,753 persons were enrolled in title V projects and another 77,281 participants had departed from the program during fiscal 1967.

(c) *Enrollee Characteristics.*—Available information indicates that the program is serving those for whom it is intended—welfare recipients or those who would be on welfare unless their employability were increased. During the 1967 fiscal year (the third year of operations), 36 percent of the enrollees were men (down from 61 percent for the first year), 64 percent were women, 92 percent were heads of households, 39 percent had 8 years or less in school (down from the 56 percent for the first year), and one-third of the participants had never previously had 6 months of continuous work experience (up from one-fifth for the first year). The trend of enrollee characteristics reflects the increased participation of women, resulting in part from the improved labor market which makes more jobs available for unemployed men and in part from the predominance of women on public assistance rolls, which is the primary source of recruitment.

(d) *Program Content.*—Work is the primary activity of the program. According to HEW, as of January 31, 1967, 44 percent of the enrollees were assigned to subprofessional, technical, clerical, and sales positions; 35 percent to service jobs; 16 percent to semiskilled and unskilled occupations; and 4 percent to farm-related jobs. Most of the work is performed for public or private nonprofit agencies, with only 3 percent of the enrollees assigned to on-the-job training with profitmaking

employers. About one out of four enrollees has received vocational training, and 39 percent have been enrolled in adult basic education. Of these, three-fourths drop out before completing the course. In addition, participants receive medical services, child care, counseling, and financial assistance.

(e) *Placements*.—The average enrollment lasts about 5 months. Follow-up statistics on participants are shown in table 4.

Table 4. Placement of persons leaving work experience and training program

	Percent
Employed.....	36
Further training.....	5
• Total.....	41
Left for good cause (medical, child care, transportation, etc.).....	17
Left without good cause.....	15
Completed training but unemployed.....	12
Projects terminated.....	3
Other (reason not specified).....	12
Total.....	100

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As this table shows, slightly over one-third were immediately placed in jobs and another 5 percent entered further training. However, there is enormous variation among projects. Ramsey County, Minn., judged to be among the best, placed 70 percent in jobs; Cleveland, Ohio, with a similar unemployment rate has placed 45 percent; eastern Kentucky, with a labor surplus, has placed 33 percent.

Of all the Federal manpower programs, the work experience and training program has the lowest rate of placement in jobs or further training. But it also aimed at the most disadvantaged of the unemployed.

(f) *Costs*.—The annual cost per enrollee who receives total public assistance support under title V is \$3,450. For those who receive only supplementary benefits, the annual cost averages \$1,450. During fiscal 1967, 64 percent of the funds went for cash payments to enrollees, 13 percent for work expenses, 11 percent for vocational instruction and adult basic education, 9 percent for health and social services, and 3 percent for project administration.

(g) *Administration*.—The 1966 amendments to title V gave the Labor Department a partial role in the administration of the work experience and training program. This reflected a congressional concern over the manpower training and job placement results of the program. Since this new arrangement did not take effect until July 1, 1967, it has not been in operation long enough for the committee to conduct an evaluation. However, the slowness of developing interdepartmental procedures suggests that divided administration contains some inherent difficulties.

At the local level the work experience and training program is another fragmented piece of the total manpower effort. With very few exceptions, the Welfare Administration insisted that the program be operated by State and county welfare departments, regardless of their competence in the manpower field. In most places, it operates on its own with little or no connection to closely related programs. So far, bringing the Labor Department into the picture has done very little

to improve this shortcoming, for Labor's part is being administered by the Bureau of Employment Security whereas all the similar programs under the Economic Opportunity Act—Neighborhood Youth Corps, Nelson amendment, and Scheuer amendment—are being handled by the Bureau of Work Programs.

(h) *Evaluation.*—The committee has found that the work experience and training program is reaching the hard-core unemployed for whom it was intended. Some of the work performed is a notable public contribution. In the best operations, significant proportions of the participants raise their employability, obtain jobs, and get off welfare. In many places it has helped to strengthen and broaden the work of public welfare agencies.

However, much of the work performed does little to raise employability, for it does not relate to occupations with job openings in regular competitive employment or to new careers with ladders of occupational advancement. The program has been operated by agencies with little or no experience in manpower programs, and many of them have failed to respond adequately to their new assignment. But the addition of the Labor Department to the administrative picture is only a partial solution, for still missing are adequate mechanisms to tie the program to a total manpower system at the community level.

4. *Community Employment and Training Program (Nelson Amendment)*

“These are people of advanced age who have been farming and because of circumstances are poor, or at least they have acquired no great amount of financial resources. Many of them have too much pride to go to the welfare and are subsisting on a very limited amount of income. Green Thumb has proved that these older men can work and work well if provided the opportunity.”—Gilbert Rhode, director, Wisconsin Farmers Union.

(a) *Purpose.*—The community employment and training program, better known as the Nelson amendment, was established by a 1965 amendment (sec. 205(d) of existing law). It has the dual purpose of providing employment and training opportunities to chronically unemployed poor and of undertaking community improvement projects.

(b) *Funding Level.*—Approximately \$49 million have been spent on this program since it began. The program was administered by OEO directly through the community action program until March 1967 when it delegated operating responsibility to the Department of Labor, which renamed the program. However, during the past year, the Foster Grandparents program, which provides jobs for older persons in children's homes, was also funded under the Nelson amendment, and it is administered jointly by HEW's Administration on Aging and OEO-CAP.

(c) *Projects.*—There were 149 projects with about 8,000 jobs during fiscal 1967. Most of these were in rural areas and small towns. Typical work assignments include the following: road repairs; landscape work in vest-pocket parks, along roadsides, and in recreational areas; maintenance work in public buildings; clerical work in police departments, hospitals and other local government agencies; construction of playgrounds, campsites, and picnic areas; and repair work on water and sewer mains. Participants are usually paid \$1.40 an hour and generally

work 40 hours a week. One of the major projects was known as "Green Thumb," a beautification program conducted in five States by the National Farmers Union. Many of the projects provide supportive services, such as health, group and individual counseling, and basic education. Where possible, the work is intended to teach skills which will lead to permanent jobs, but training is a secondary emphasis with work the primary concern.

(d) *Participants*.—The program serves chronically unemployed, low-income adults, 22 years and older, but most of the participants are older persons. OEO has not kept records of either the characteristics of the participants or the total number of persons who have taken part in the program, and the Labor Department does not yet have such information.

(e) *Evaluation*.—The committee, based upon hearings and staff studies, has concluded that this is an effective program which deserves continuation and expansion. Where possible, the training aspects should be improved. However, for older persons the work provided is a desirable result by itself, for it offers a source of income to those who cannot find other work and it makes significant contributions to community improvement.

5. *New Careers Program (Scheuer Amendment)*

"The essence of getting out of poverty is a job and a job that leads somewhere. You provide the job, the entry level job, essentially a simple job, that people can be taught to do in a few weeks. You build on the job the added training to make him more proficient and then move him up. This is an essential feature for meeting of manpower shortages, and at the same time provides the employment for people."—Dr. Frank Riessman, director, New Careers Development Center, New York University.

(a) *Purpose*.—The new careers program was established by a 1966 amendment (sec. 205(e) of existing law). Its purpose is to develop entry level employment opportunities in subprofessional positions which can lead to career advancement. It is focused on the public sector in such fields as health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. It builds on the earlier use of subprofessionals by community action agencies.

(b) *Funding Level*.—During the 1967 fiscal year, \$36 million were available for this program. Administrative responsibility has been delegated by OEO to the Department of Labor, where it is run by the Bureau of Work Programs.

(c) *Projects*.—During fiscal 1967, 59 projects were funded, and altogether they would create 9,384 positions. Primary emphasis is upon training which will lead upward on a career ladder. The first step would be work under professional supervision at an entry level job with supplementary education, including basic education if necessary and enrollment in courses at training institutions. The second step would be the performance of work assignments requiring greater skill, emphasizing on-the-job training. The third step would be a permanent position on an agency staff, with certification as necessary, such as for a practical nurse, an occupational therapist, an assistant teacher, a patrolman, and other civil service positions.

(d) *Participants*.—No information is yet available about who is participating in this program.

(e) *Evaluation*.—The new careers program is too new for evaluation. However, the committee notes that while the early emphasis is upon training, which is proper, it appears that not enough attention is being given to assuring that “new career” jobs, paid by other funds, will be available at the completion of training. It will not be easy to break down traditional barriers, such as civil service regulations and professional “standards”, which block the disadvantaged from moving into public service occupations, but considerable effort must be made in this regard if the program is to succeed.

6. *Concentrated Employment Program*

In the spring of 1967 the Labor Department created a pool of funds totaling nearly \$100 million from the delegated manpower programs of the Economic Opportunity Act and from the Manpower Development and Training Act, to be used for a concentrated employment program. By June 30, 1967, grants had been made to 19 cities and two rural areas. In the cities, the program will be concentrated in specific, inner-city neighborhoods with high concentrations of unemployment. The two rural areas—the Mississippi Delta and northern Michigan—have severe and chronic unemployment.

The program is intended to reach out and recruit those persons in the areas served who are most in need of training or work. It provides a 2-week general orientation program in which coaches or counselors will work with enrollees on an individual basis to prepare them for referral to the action phase of the program. It then refers enrollees either to jobs, the most suitable training program, or to school when that is deemed appropriate, or a combination of the three. A serious effort will be made to work with private employers and labor unions to line up specific job opportunities that have previously been closed to the hard-core jobless (such as persons with police records). There will be followup by coaches into employment so that even after an enrollee takes a job, his coach will provide whatever assistance is necessary to make him self-sufficient on the job. Throughout the program, enrollees will receive whatever supportive services are required to allow them to move toward productive employment. This support will include, where necessary, medical and dental care, legal help, day-care facilities for children of working mothers, and orientation on the use of available transportation.

In all but two of the 19 cities, the community action agencies are serving as the prime sponsor and coordinating body, but the State employment service and other manpower agencies will play important roles. At the Federal level, OEO and HEW are cooperating with the program. Altogether it is potentially the best coordinated manpower effort developed so far.

7. *Other Manpower Services*

(a) *Community Action Program*.—In addition to these specific programs established by the Economic Opportunity Act, a number of other manpower activities have been financed under the general authority of the community action program (CAP). The CAP neighborhood centers provide space and staff for decentralized employment services, including outreaching recruitment. CAP money has been used to finance mechanisms for the overall coordination of community

manpower programs. Varied special training programs have been initiated, and one of these, the Industrialization Opportunity Center, has been duplicated in a number of communities after earlier successful experience in Philadelphia.

Some of the other Federal manpower programs have also been mobilized to support the poverty program, and the committee has examined how effective this support has been.

(b) *Manpower Development and Training Act.*—The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA) was initially designed to retrain experienced adults whose skills have been made obsolete by economic and technological change. Initially, it was not seen as a poverty program, but as economic activity increased and experienced workers were rehired, the focus of MDTA has shifted to serving proportionately greater numbers of the disadvantaged. At present, at least half the persons trained by institutional programs are from low-income families, but the proportion is considerably lower for those in on-the-job training (OJT). However, persons with 8 years or less of education and persons over 44 are underrepresented both in institutional training and OJT, but especially in the latter. Although non-white persons appear to get their share of MDTA institutional positions, there is evidence of an unfavorable selectivity in the occupations for which Negroes are trained. This selectivity is evident nationally but is particularly noticeable in MDTA enrollments in Southern States.

MDTA gives unemployed, low-income persons training which makes them more employable and reduces (but does not totally eliminate) their unemployment. OJT, with 93.6 percent placed in jobs (90.6 percent training related), has a better placement record than institutional training, with 75.0 percent placed in jobs (62.5 percent training related). However, OJT serves relatively fewer disadvantaged persons. An effort has been made to couple institutional training, which is more efficient for basic education and general skills, with OJT, which is best for acquiring specialized skills; but the "coupled" program is falling far behind the goal established by the Labor Department. Dr. Garth Mangum, in a study conducted for the committee, has concluded that the major obstacle appears to be conflicting philosophies and resulting lack of cooperation between the operators of the two potentially complementary types of training.

MDTA has had a significant upward effect on the straight time hourly earnings of those who completed training and were successful in finding employment. The median increase has been from \$1.44 an hour before training to \$1.74 an hour after training. The program has also had an impact in reorienting such traditional institutions as the public employment services and the public schools, particularly the vocational schools.

(c) *Employment Service.*—The U.S. Employment Service over the years has developed practices which tend to make it employer oriented and to deal more with persons who have greater labor market potential (those with enough work experience to receive unemployment compensation) than with the hard-core unemployed. However, in recent years this has begun to change, and the poverty program has accelerated this process. (The committee observed an outstanding office in Johnstown, Pa.) The Employment Service contributes to the national antipoverty effort in a number of ways: cooperating with community

action agencies by outstationing employment service personnel in neighborhood centers; operating youth opportunity centers and a human resource development program, both with a focus mainly on the poor; recruiting for the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps; providing special services to those rejected by selective service, many of whom are poor; improving continuity of employment for seasonal farmworkers, most of whom are poor; identifying eligible workers and "reasonable expectations of employment" for development of MDTA projects; offering counseling, testing, and placement services to all, poor and nonpoor; and serving unemployment insurance recipients, many of whom are poor.

The Employment Service had 28,500 positions in fiscal 1967, with 10,000 assigned to serve various disadvantaged groups, including 4,500 in youth opportunity centers. As of April 1967, 760 Employment Service personnel were outstationed in neighborhood centers sponsored by the community action program in 174 cities in 35 States. About 260 nonprofessionals had been hired, most of them residents of the neighborhoods served. In spite of this progress, these numbers are but a small portion of the total staff. Moreover, there still tends to be a substantial philosophical gulf between those whose allegiance is to the poor (community action agencies) and those whose objective is a more effective labor market (the U.S. Employment Service).

How far the Employment Service has yet to go is illustrated by the youth opportunity centers (YOC). Of the 1.2 million applicants in 1966, only 22 percent were high school dropouts although 35 percent of the intake came from neighborhood centers, welfare agencies, and similar sources. Only 1.8 percent of YOC applicants have been referred to the Job Corps and 6.7 percent to the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Nonetheless, the YOC has recruited 35 percent of Job Corps enrollees and 44 percent of those enrolling in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The YOC's report they found jobs for 29 percent of their applicants but the addition of referrals to MDTA, NYC, Job Corps, and other training programs raises the success rate to 40 percent.

During the past year the Employment Service has extended its interest in the disadvantaged to adults as well and has established the human resources development program, which, in effect, expands the youth opportunity centers to serve all ages. Funds have been reallocated and new resources have been obtained for this purpose.

8. Summary Findings: Lack of a Complete System

During the course of its examination of the poverty program, the committee has found widespread evidence that Federal manpower programs are badly fragmented. From the point of view of the poor who seek training and jobs, this is a very undesirable situation, for they are unable to obtain a continuity of services which lead to full-time employment. For example, many adult literacy programs do not train up to the level for entry into MDTA programs. Very few Neighborhood Youth Corps graduates go into the Job Corps or into MDTA training. Often the need for supportive services and remedial education is unmet.

The most meaningful level for coordination is the local community where the unemployed live and work. Yet, a community has great difficulty in putting together a total manpower system. Some of the Federal program funds go through the States in a variety of special

programs—work experience and training, MDTA, the Employment Service, apprenticeship training, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. Others go directly to the community, but usually in separate grants—Neighborhood Youth Corps, Nelson amendment, Scheuer amendment, special impact, and various projects financed under the community action program.

Of the various unsolved problems in the Federal effort to eliminate poverty in America, coordination stands out. And of all the fields of service, the manpower program is the most badly fragmented and needs the greatest attention.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

The committee has concluded that a more effective, total manpower system is needed in the United States, one which would provide for a coordinated approach at all levels—Federal, State, and local. To achieve this objective completely goes far beyond the scope of the Economic Opportunity Act and cannot be accomplished at this time. However, to the extent that manpower programs are authorized by this act, the committee bill takes a first step toward building a better manpower system.

1. Purpose

The bill consolidates the manpower activities carried out at the community level under the Economic Opportunity Act into part B of title I. The focus is upon unemployed or low-income persons, both youths and adults, with emphasis upon local initiative and upon effectively utilizing all available public and private resources (sec. 120). The act assigns responsibility to the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but it is expected that he will delegate operating responsibility to the Secretary of Labor, using a delegation order which promotes maximum coordination with other parts of the poverty program.

2. Prime Sponsor

Two major mechanisms are used to achieve coordination. First, drawing on the experience of the concentrated employment program funds will be channeled to the communities through a prime sponsor, which will be the community action agency unless the Director determines that an alternative sponsor, such as a municipal manpower department, is likely to have greater capability. The prime sponsor must provide for participation of employers, labor organizations, and residents of the areas and members of the groups served (sec. 122).

3. Comprehensive Program

Second, the prime sponsor is required to develop and implement a comprehensive work and training program which provides participants a wide range of choices and an unbroken sequence of services which will enable them to obtain and hold employment. This would consist of a systematic approach, linking together programs financed under the Economic Opportunity Act, other Federal programs, and private efforts (sec. 121(c)). It is expected that commonsense will be used to implement this requirement so that action programs are not delayed while a "plan" is being made, but at the same time a

planning and implementation process should be instituted which leads to an effective community manpower system. To assure that this happens, the comprehensive work and training program required by this act should be interconnected to the comprehensive area manpower planning system (CAMPS) recently instituted, which utilizes the MDTA program as the point of departure. The goal should be a single community manpower system for the poor with considerable local flexibility on how this should be brought about.

4. Delegate Agencies

It is intended that the prime sponsor concentrate its main efforts on planning and coordination and not operate all the community programs, although it may conduct some activities if appropriate. But extensive use should be made of delegate agencies, including both the established agencies, such as those which receive funds under other Federal programs, and also new neighborhood-based organizations formed by residents of the areas served (sec. 122 (d)). If necessary to enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served, the director may provide funds directly to independent agencies rather than going through the prime sponsors (sec. 123(c)), but this authority should be used in such a way as not to undermine the systematic approach. For example, this might be done with the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps in certain communities, but the authority for independent financing should not be used in such a manner that it undermines a community's comprehensive approach.

5. Eligible Activities

Authority for all the existing programs is continued, including the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Nelson amendment, Scheuer amendment, and the concentrated employment program, along with necessary supportive services and administrative staff (sec. 123(a)). The upper age limit is removed from work and training programs of the type conducted by the out-of-school Neighborhood Youth Corps, recognizing that some adults could benefit from such activity, and sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job training is required in order to remedy the training shortcomings of the present program (sec. 123(a)(2)). Lack of employment opportunity is added to the possible criteria for eligibility in the Nelson amendment program (sec. 123(a)(3)), and while it is hoped that participants can be placed in competitive employment as soon as possible, they should not be pushed out if there are no jobs available. The Scheuer amendment is further elaborated to stress the need to create new careers with job ladder opportunities (sec. 123(a)(4)). The concentrated employment program is given legislative authorization (sec. 123(a)(5)), and it could be carried out in urban areas with concentrations of low-income unemployed persons and in rural areas with high proportions of such persons. It is also intended that communities may exercise local initiative to develop other component programs consistent with the purposes of this part.

The committee bill permits financial assistance for recruitment, counseling, and placement services, which may be conducted by public or private organizations (sec. 123 (b) (7)). Preference, however, should be given to the U.S. Employment Service where appropriate. In any case, all such activities funded under this act must complement, and not duplicate, the work of the Employment Service, which in turn

should be encouraged to outstation personnel in neighborhood centers and mobile units which serve the poor, using its own resources as far as possible but as necessary supplemented by funds from this act.

A new eligible activity is the provision of incentives to private employers other than nonprofit organizations to hire and train unemployed or low-income persons (sec. 123(a)(8)). The committee feels, based on reports which it has received, that in many cases the incentives and reimbursements to private employers under existing programs are inadequate to induce such employers to hire and train one-the-job unemployed and severely disadvantaged individuals. A variety of such new incentives should be made available to induce the private sector to take a greater role in the employment and training of such persons. These incentives might take the form of reimbursements to employers for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive. However, wages shall be paid only by the employer and must be not less than the Federal minimum wage. Payments may be made to employers for on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, and for recruitment in areas with high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons. Employers may also be given financial assistance to enable them to provide transportation assistance to employees, particularly when the low-income areas are a considerable distance from the place of employment. The committee increased the requested authorization for title I part B by \$10 million to assure funds for this special incentive program and feels that at least \$15 million should be allocated for these purposes in fiscal year 1968.

The committee expects that appropriate regulations will be issued to safeguard against abuses of any of these incentive programs, including but not limited to safeguards against the use of such incentives by any employer in order to transfer any enterprise from one area to another and safeguards designed to prevent the incentives from being used as a subsidy for normal operations. The incentive program should, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development and upward mobility of individual participants.

6. Funding Consolidation

Previously existing community activities financed by this part are required to be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program by July 1, 1968, and funds must be channeled through the prime sponsor after that date (sec. 123(b)). The Director, however, may give an extension of time for good cause, as for example in some rural communities which may not have yet developed an adequate administrative structure to serve as prime sponsor. However, the process of funding consolidation should not be allowed to disrupt program operations, and generally the present program operators should continue as delegate agencies. Where conflicts are unresolved between the designated prime sponsor and the present operations, the Director has the option of independent funding (sec. 123(c)) until the community manpower system is more fully developed; this might be the case in some rural areas with "green thumb" programs which are activities that should, at least initially, continue under direct funding. To the maximum extent feasible, the work and training components of the title V, work experience and training program, should be made part of the community's comprehensive work and training program.

Where appropriate, funds for such components should be channeled through the prime sponsor although it is recognized that this will not always be practicable, such as where the work experience and training program operates on a statewide basis.

7. Participants

Program participants in programs authorized under part B must be unemployed or low-income persons and permanent residents of the United States (sec. 125). The definition of "low income" should be the same for this part and title II, with the Director consulting with the Social Security Administrator. Special attention would be given to providing employment opportunities to persons 55 years and older, for this group of the poor has been served inadequately in the past (sec. 126).

8. Special Conditions

The bill retains the special conditions of existing law which preclude employment on projects involving political parties or facilities for use for sectarian or religious worship, and which provide protection for employed workers and existing contracts of service. Program activities related to physical improvement must give preference to those which benefit low-income persons (sec. 124).

9. Pilot Projects, Technical Assistance and Training

The committee bill establishes a program of pilot projects designed to develop new approaches and requires that one focus of such projects be the encouragement of maximum participation of private, profit-making employers (sec. 127). Provision is also made for technical assistance and training (sec. 128). The States are given a role for technical assistance, coordination of related State activities, operation of work and training programs in communities without an acceptable prime sponsor, and provision of work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies (sec. 129).

10. Fund Allocation

Up to 20 percent of the funds authorized for this title may be reserved for the concentrated employment program and allocated in a manner that does not permit more than 12½ percent to go to any one State. The other funds for comprehensive work and training programs must be allocated so as to meet the criteria which apply to the Neighborhood Youth Corps in existing law, that is, to take into account rates of population, unemployment, and family income levels (sec. 130). The maximum Federal share is 90 percent for these basic activities, and a community may pool its matching contributions with those required in title II for the community action program (sec. 131).

11. Evaluation

The bill requires the development and implementation of a program data system and an evaluation program so that the results of these programs can be carefully measured and compared with other Federal manpower programs (sec. 132). The committee expects OEO and the Labor Department to begin the publication of comparative results within 1 year.

VI. SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAM

"The economic development of ghetto areas is a prime concern of the advantaged as well as its disadvantaged throughout the city as well. It is a fact that no community is better than its weakest elements."—J. Bruce Llewellyn, executive director, New York Small Business Development Center.

A. FINDINGS

The special impact program was added as part D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1966. The purpose was to establish special programs in communities and neighborhoods with especially large concentrations of low-income persons. The committee's intent was that the number of communities selected should be limited so that sufficient resources could be available to have a significant impact in those selected. The authority of the amendment was broad enough to permit economic and community development as well as manpower training activities.

Responsibility for the special impact program was delegated by the Director of OEO to the Secretary of Labor, who assigned the program to the Manpower Administration. The Labor Department used the funds in two ways: \$17.4 million was allocated to the concentrated employment program, which was discussed previously, and the remaining \$6.9 million was granted for a program in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of New York City for an effort more in line with the committee's original intentions. For this latter program, the Labor Department signed a 2-year contract with two nonprofit corporations to conduct components related to (1) industrial development, (2) community facility development, (3) community rehabilitation planning, (4) community home improvement, and (5) related manpower services. This effort has just commenced.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee bill authorizes the continuation and expansion of the special impact program, contained in title I, part D. Although the committee had intended that the funds provided for this program be concentrated primarily on economic and community development and manpower training, the Labor Department, to whom the program was delegated, used a substantial part of the funds for the concentrated employment program. Economic development activities, in particular, were deemphasized. Since the concentrated employment program is given a separate authorization (sec. 123(a)(5)), the special impact funds this year should be used as the committee originally intended.

1. Purpose

The purpose of the program is to commit enough resources to selected urban and rural areas with large concentrations and high proportions of low-income persons in order to have an appreciable impact. Thus, the number of areas selected should be restricted in number so that each will have sufficient funds to achieve the intended results (sec. 150). The program has been amended to authorize assistance to rural areas, with an emphasis upon those rural areas

having substantial outmigration to urban areas served. In this manner, the committee has recognized that the solution of problems of unemployment in urban ghettos requires a concurrent attack on rural unemployment which is stimulating heavy population migration to the city slums.

2. Financial Assistance

The bill authorizes financial assistance for both public and private organizations, including private profitmaking organizations as appropriate (sec. 151). Such assistance may be provided either through grant or contract.

3. Eligible Activities

Among the eligible activities are the following: (1) economic and business development programs, which may include provision of (a) financial and other incentives to businesses to locate in or near the areas served and (b) technical and management assistance to small businesses in the area or owned by area residents; (2) community development activities, particularly those which create new training and employment opportunities and which contribute to an improved living environment in the program area; and (3) manpower training programs which support and complement the economic and community development programs (sec. 151). A wide variety of economic development and small business assistance activities are intended to be authorized by this section, including preparation of economic development plans, conduct of economic and market research, the furnishing of loans, loan guarantees, insurance, and other economic incentives, and the furnishing of technical assistance. Since the Economic Development Administration has substantially greater expertise and experience in these areas than does either the Office of Economic Opportunity or the Department of Labor, the committee expects that it will play a major roll in the economic development and small business assistance aspects of the special impact program. Every effort should be made by the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce to develop joint application and funding procedures covering both the manpower training and economic development aspects of any special impact project, including the use of authority made available under section 612.

The committee expects that the Secretary of Commerce will use such funds provided pursuant to section 151 as may be necessary to add personnel needed by his Department to implement this economic development and small business assistance program.

4. Coordination

The special impact program should be very closely linked to related activities, including other programs of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act, the model cities program, and other community development programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (sec. 152(a)(4)). The committee has carefully studied these other programs and has concluded that none of them is able to achieve what is intended in the special impact program. The economic development program, which the Commerce Department administers, is not permitted to focus on a limited community within a large city, as this program intends, nor

does it have sufficient program breadth to deal with many of the interrelated and underlying economic causes of poverty in urban slums. Nonetheless, many of these other programs have contributions to make and should be mobilized in a total approach. To promote this objective, the bill (a) requires the Secretary of HUD to take necessary steps to assure that urban renewal land is available for business location and expansion, (b) makes the special impact project areas "redevelopment areas" within the meaning of the Public Works and Economic Development Act, and (c) encourages the use of Federal contracts, subcontracts, and deposits to promote the economic development of the project areas (sec. 153).

5. Business Participation

Participation of local businessmen from the poverty area involved, as well as business leaders from the city as a whole, and the State in the case of rural programs, is an essential part of the special impact program. They should be involved, for example, on boards of directors of agencies implementing the program, on advisory councils, and in other ways.

6. Community Participation

Experience of the first year's operation demonstrates that successful program operation, including active participation by business, requires and depends on the utmost cooperation of community residents. That cooperation, in the view of the committee, will best be achieved through effective and substantial participation of the residents in program decisions, responsibility, and benefits. Community and community-based corporations, which have demonstrated their potential utility as vehicles for such participation, should be encouraged by the Department of Labor to undertake sponsorship of programs under this part.

VII. COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

* * * "The community action concept, in my opinion, with its additional corollary of 'maximum feasible participation of the poor,' is the greatest innovation in social thinking, 'to insure domestic tranquillity and to promote the general welfare' that has come about in 100 years."—Andrew Carr, chairman, Coahoma Opportunities, Inc., Clarksdale, Miss.

A. FINDINGS

1. Background

The community action program (CAP) is the most complicated and the most controversial of all the programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act. It takes many shapes and sizes in over 1,000 communities around the Nation. Beyond what these communities have originated, a number of national emphasis programs have been initiated under the broad authority of title II, and several hundred pilot programs have experimented with other new approaches to combating poverty.

At present, community action agencies and their delegate agencies employ about 95,000 persons of whom 41,000, or 43 percent, are drawn from the ranks of the poor. There are no adequate data to give an unduplicated count of how many have been reached (but some of the programs have reliable figures which will be presented as

these programs are discussed). During the first 2½ years, \$1.4 billion in Federal funds have been obligated for the community action program, and a breakdown of what these funds went for is shown in table 5.

Table 5. Federal expenditures for community action program, by major program components, 1965-67

[In millions]	
Major program components:	
Child development, including Headstart.....	\$517
Education.....	182
Neighborhood centers and social services.....	152
Manpower training and employment.....	95
Health.....	75
Neighborhood organization.....	46
Legal services.....	44
Cultural and recreation.....	39
Housing and community facilities.....	29
Consumer and homemaking.....	21
General summer activities (1967).....	14
Family planning.....	14
Economic development.....	8
Food.....	4
Emergency loans.....	1
Subtotal.....	1, 241
Other expenditures:	
Administration, including evaluation.....	103
Local program planning.....	34
Technical assistance to communities.....	30
Research and development.....	28
Subtotal.....	195
Grand total.....	1, 435

Source: Office of Economic Opportunity.

2. Overview of Community Action

Community action agencies (CAA's) are engaged in a variety of tasks, including provision of direct services, coordination, planning, citizen organization, and improving local service systems. Most CAA's have a mixture of these different functions, and the combination varies from place to place, partly depending on who controls the community action program. There seems to be some confusion of purpose, partly as a result of the general nature of the original act and partly as a result of repeated shifts in OEO and congressional emphasis.

(a) *Program Emphasis.*—Almost all of the community action agencies are engaged in direct services which are designed to aid the poor. Headstart and other child development programs have been the largest program, taking 36 percent of all funds. During the first year education received heavy emphasis, but the proportionate amount fell in each of the last 2 years. Very little was done in manpower development and employment during the first year, but this has increased although funding is more and more coming from programs other than title II, except the Nelson and Scheurer programs. Multi-service neighborhood centers have been strongly pushed by OEO and readily accepted by community action agencies. Health programs have expanded during the past year. By and large services have tended to concentrate on the young rather than the old.

Most community action agencies seem to be concerned only with those services which are funded by the Economic Opportunity Act. A relatively small number have the orientation and capacity to mobilize and utilize a wide array of public and private resources in a community attack on poverty. For these, *coordination* is a major function. This is done both at the communitywide level and through multipurpose neighborhood centers, which have services provided by a number of agencies. The CAA's which are able to undertake a coordinating role are those which are supported by the community's "governing coalition," particularly local government in almost all cases.

Related to coordination is *planning*, but this function is performed more rarely by the community action agencies. The original emphasis was on getting into action quickly, and there was a congressional bias against developing a comprehensive plan first. Also, the precarious funding situation, with 1 year authorizations and appropriations made long after the fiscal year has started, has been a real deterrent to long-range planning. However, OEO is now working with a few communities on a pilot basis to develop planning techniques.

Citizen organization receives a varying amount of emphasis, ranging from the almost complete fund allocation for this purpose in one or two places to none at all in other communities. The committee arranged for case studies of 35 representative programs and found that less than half sponsor citizen organization as a separate process, but most have some form of outreach work and advisory committees related to specific programs. The 1966 amendment requiring one-third of the governing body to be representatives of the poor is increasing the use of area boards and neighborhood advisory councils, which usually select the representatives.

Recognizing that one of the causes of poverty is the failure of many of the established agencies and institutions to serve the poor adequately, some of the CAA's make a deliberate attempt to improve the performance of these other agencies, a process sometimes referred to as *institutional change*. Community action agencies which have had the greatest success in bringing about changes which benefit the poor are those where the CAA is part of a governing coalition committed to community improvement, and in such communities CAP funds are used as a multiplier to effect institutional change. At the other extreme, a few CAA's use a strategy of developing "power for the poor" to confront the established agencies, sometimes through purposefully created conflict. This happens in but a handful of communities, contrary to a popular stereotype. In most places, the community action program is a constructive effort, heavily focused on services with institutional change as only an incidental emphasis.

Yet, in many communities the services offer some differences from older approaches, and here the uniqueness of the community action program shows up. This is well illustrated by Headstart.

First, Headstart provides a combination of educational, health, child care, and family services whereas in an age of specialization such services tend to operate separately in most communities. Second, Headstart offers a new approach to the role of parents and other citizens. In a few locales this is not much more than service to parents, although most programs are providing parents employment opportunities in the program. In a growing number of communities, parents

and other citizens are acting in a policy advisory capacity, and in a few instances, the residents are completely in charge through a delegate agency which they control (such as in Bolivar County, Miss.). Third, Headstart is being used to modify the practices of existing institutions, particularly elementary schools. Where this occurs, the money invested in actual services pay dividends by favorably influencing the way in which other funds are spent. Fourth, Headstart uses a considerable number of volunteers, thus broadening the degree of community participation. And fifth, Headstart focuses upon opportunity and prevention, thus seeking to break the cycle of poverty.

(b) *Resident Participation*.—Community action agencies are utilizing a variety of means to achieve resident participation. These include membership on the governing board, employment of residents especially as subprofessionals, neighborhood boards and area councils, delegate agencies controlled by persons served, program advisory committees, parent groups for Headstart and school programs, independent citizen organizations, neighborhood meetings, newsletters, and, in rare instances, social protest.

The value of resident participation is gaining wider acceptance each year. In the course of the committee's hearings, several lay persons who have been on boards of social welfare agencies for years commented favorably on the value of participation of the poor, both for the ideas they contribute and for the channels of communication which are opened. As Frederick B. Lee, chairman of Washington's United Planning Organization, said:

With the start of the poverty program for the first time in this community we have involved the poor in the consideration of the policies of the programs which affect them. This is an innovation in this city.

But frequent statements at the hearings also indicated that a strong effect of congressional earmarking and OEO-determined priorities has been to reduce substantially the role of representatives of the poor in the allocation of funds. As Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York pleaded:

We strongly urge you to preserve the voice of the neighborhoods in the use of community action funds. Earmarking of funds for community action is doubly harmful. It not only inhibits further experimentation by freezing the present range of programs, but also discourages active participation of the community by limiting sharply the role that it can play.

(c) *Political Activities and Social Protest*.—In an effort as broad as the community action program, incidents of improper conduct occur from time to time. In the 35 case-study communities, the committee's consultants recorded only one occurrence of misuse of CAP funds for partisan political purposes and that situation had already been corrected by OEO and the General Accounting Office. Citizen organization has sometimes led to social protest activities, but rarely has this exceeded the guarantee of the first amendment "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." Excesses are episodic and not a general pattern.

This is an urgent issue currently because of the charges and counter-charges on the causes of the urban riots. By chance, the committee's consultants had studied both Newark and Detroit in April and May. On the one hand, the community action program in Newark was found to be troubled with internal and external conflict in spite of some successes with neighborhood boards and manpower programs. On the other hand, Detroit was found to have one of the most effective programs of those studied, with strong leadership from City Hall and substantial citizen support. Newark was tense while Detroit, on the surface at least, was harmonious. Yet, both cities had riots.

The committee believes it is clear that the causes of civil disorder lie far deeper than the success or failure of a specific program, that the poverty program, because it has never been funded at a level commensurate with needs, at its best is barely scratching the surface of community problems, and that the remedies will be far costlier and much more difficult than the limited efforts so far underway.

Another measure of the community action program is the evidence that in 32 cities in which disorders broke out this summer, only 16 persons out of a total of nearly 12,000 persons arrested were known to be paid poverty workers. Of these 16, nine were summer employees serving in such capacities as recreation aides and outreach workers, one was a VISTA, and the remaining six were full-time employees of community action agencies or their delegates. In all there were nearly 12,000 poverty workers employed in these areas. In addition, while the estimated property damage in the riot areas approached nearly \$300 million, none of the 244 neighborhood facilities of the antipoverty programs located in the immediate areas was looted or burned. Seven antipoverty sites, however, had broken windows amounting to less than \$2,000 in total damages.

Furthermore, a spot check survey of 43 cities, one-quarter of which had disturbances this summer, revealed that OEO summer programs, for which Congress made a supplemental appropriation of \$75 million in May, helped to prevent violence and program participants exercised a calming influence in troubled areas. The survey, based on statements from such local officials as mayors and police chiefs, was performed by OEO's Office for Inspection in August. According to the survey, in more than a dozen cities, including Pittsburgh, Pa., Lansing, Mich., New Orleans, La., and San Antonio, Tex., these summer funds were used in part for programs which involved joint efforts of the police departments and CAP agencies. In such cities as Los Angeles, Calif., Wichita, Kans., Providence, R.I., and Portland, Oreg., program participants formed special groups to patrol and quiet troubled areas. According to local officials in such cities as Oakland, Calif., Cleveland, Ohio, Baton Rouge, La., and Chester, Pa., jobs provided by the summer programs contributed in large part to preventing violence in their cities. In addition, officials in such cities as Dallas, Tex., Oklahoma City, Okla., and Evansville, Ind., attributed the decline in juvenile arrests in their cities this summer, in part to the OEO summer programs.

(d) *Relationship to Local Government.*—The relationship of the community action agency to local government ranges from those communities where the CAA is part of municipal government (as in Chicago and Detroit) to the few places where the CAA is fighting city hall or the county courthouse (as in San Francisco). In most places,

the CAA is a private, nonprofit agency which provides representation to the elected chief executive or public agencies. In some locales, though, the local officials are opposed to the purposes of the poverty program and do not sit on the CAA board. The general picture, after 2½ years, is more harmonious than stormy although an effective working relationship has not yet developed in some communities.

(e) *Delegate Agencies*.—Public and private agencies which serve the poor are participating extensively. In most communities, they are represented on the governing board of the community action agency, and they often serve as delegate agencies to operate programs. In practice, it is rare for a community action agency to run all activities, except where there are only one or two program components, but the pattern of delegation is quite varied. There is an increasing use of delegate agencies in which the poor or their representatives control or at least play a major role, and this has been one of the more creative and successful applications of maximum feasible resident participation.

(f) *Conclusion*.—After reviewing the community action program, the committee shares the conclusion stated by one of its consultants (Center for Urban Studies, University of Chicago): "Our case studies suggest that the participation of the poor, delivery of services, and service innovation are mutually reinforcing in the development of antipoverty programs."

3. Community Action Program Components

(a) *Headstart*.—

"I had a little boy who didn't know what a cloud was. He had seen clouds but nobody even bothered to tell him, 'That is a cloud,' or what it did, and I think maybe that is why there is such a language barrier, because these children don't have any experiences to talk about."—Mrs. Susan Valdez, Headstart teacher, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

The Headstart program was initiated in the spring of 1965 by OEO as a broad-gaged child development program. It was founded on the belief that there is a cycle of poverty which begins when a child is born into a poor family. There, the environment is often such that "learning readiness" is inadequate to prepare the child for school experience.

Headstart projects are designed to prepare the child for school by providing health services, including dental and medical examinations, sight and hearing tests, immunizations, and so forth; nutritional supplements in the form of one, and frequently two, meals a day; small classes (maximum of 15) with one teacher and two teacher aides, with an emphasis on "doing," rather than passive listening; involvement of parents through participation in advisory councils and as subprofessional staff members (on a paid or voluntary basis); and social services to meet the multiple problems of the children's families, including referrals for family counseling.

More than 700,000 children participated in Headstart programs funded during fiscal year 1967—over one-half million in 8-week summer programs and more than 190,000 in full-year programs, averaging 9 months—at a cost of \$352 million, or 42 percent of the total title II allocation for 1967. Full-year programs involved approximately 76,200 staff personnel during fiscal year 1967, of whom more than one-

half were volunteers, accounted for in the local communities' non-Federal share of costs. The paid staff were about equally divided between professionals (teachers, social workers, medical personnel, et cetera) and subprofessionals (teacher aides, cooks, health aides). Indigenous poor persons constitute a sizable majority of the subprofessionals and volunteers working in Headstart programs.

OEO has sponsored a wide range of evaluative studies on Headstart, and while all the results are not in, several findings have emerged. Intellectual and social development advances during the time spent in Headstart. The differences in program impact on the children relate more to the quality of the program than to its duration (2, 4, or 6 months), but a full-year program is preferred if possible. But unless the elementary school is sufficiently prepared to receive Headstart children, there is danger that the early gains will be eroded. As a result, OEO has proposed a new program known as Follow-Through.

(b) Legal Services Program.—

"Our experience has demonstrated to us that laws without lawyers are not effective laws; that the poor believe themselves to be outside the protection of the law because they do not have access to lawyers."—James Lorenz, director, rural legal assistance project, California.

OEO established its legal services program to help solve legal problems which confront the poor. The program provides counsel and legal representation to poor people; conducts education on legal rights and responsibilities; encourages law reform through test cases and legislation; represents groups and organizations of the poor; and in other ways makes the law more responsive to the needs of low-income persons.

In fiscal 1967 this program provided funds for 600 neighborhood law offices, staffed by 1,200 lawyers, and operating in 45 States. More than 300,000 poor people were served. Cases involved tenant-landlord relations, housing code violations, public housing regulations, sales agreements and contracts, wage claims, bankruptcy, administrative problems with welfare, social security, workmen's compensation, juvenile offenses, and family problems such as divorce, annulment, nonsupport, and adoption. There has been relatively little involvement in criminal matters since all States are now required to provide counsel to indigent defendants in criminal cases.

Only a small fraction of the cases went to trial. Of these, legal services lawyers won three-fourths, and they have been successful four-fifths of the time in obtaining reversals of administrative decisions of governmental agencies. Persons who do not meet the indigency standards are referred to private attorneys.

Yet, the legal services program can scarcely keep up with the volume of cases in the communities where it is active, not to speak of places waiting for funds to start the program. The committee concludes, therefore, that more attention should be given to test cases and law reform.

(c) Comprehensive Health Centers.—

"The neighborhood health center itself is more than a health service. It attempts to be a new kind of community institution promoting social change, community organization,

community health action, and unfamiliar health services.”—
Dr. Jack Geiger, Tufts Medical School, Boston, Mass.

Commencing in the 1966 fiscal year OEO gave support to eight pilot, comprehensive health centers, which attempted to integrate under one roof traditionally fragmented medical, paramedical, and related social service resources. Impressed by this concept, Congress adopted this as a national emphasis program in a 1966 amendment. By the end of fiscal 1967, \$49 million were granted for the creation of 30 comprehensive health centers, which will have the capacity to serve 675,000 poor persons each year.

One of the most significant aspects of these health center operations is that they are delivering comprehensive rather than fragmented health services into neighborhoods where the poor reside. And for the first time, the neighborhood residents themselves are involved in the planning and operation of the centers.

The centers are providing direct employment opportunities for the poor as health assistants, receptionists, telephone operators, and other subprofessional occupations necessary for staffing centers. The centers seek to involve non-OEO agencies and funds, including local as well as Federal sources. Local hospitals, health departments, medical schools, and medical and dental societies are participating in the centers. Reimbursable payments for recipients of health center services provided under title 18 and 19 of the 1965 Amendments to the Social Security Act are available, and in at least one center funds provided by the Children's Bureau are being utilized.

The committee believes that the establishment of comprehensive health centers in poor neighborhoods is a step in the right direction. However, the total health needs of the poor will never be met with such centers alone. What is needed is a truly comprehensive approach to the entire system of health services, both private and public, so that there can be effective continuity of services among private practitioners, neighborhood health centers, clinics, hospitals, specialized medical institutions, nursing homes, programs of home care, and programs aimed at improvement in environmental health in poor neighborhoods. OEO alone cannot be expected to bring about improvements in the total health system, but it can be a catalyst. It is hoped that in the future the Public Health Service might also play a more affirmative role in improving health programs for the poor.

(d) Upward Bound.—

“As of last year at this time, I had no plans at all for my future, I had not intended on attending college. Today I can say that I plan to attend college directly because of Upward Bound. In college, I am going to major in chemistry, for the purpose of premedical training.”—Robert Hedglin, Upward Bound participant, Johnstown, Pa.

Upward Bound is a program designed to assist poor underachieving high school students who otherwise would not have been motivated toward higher education to prepare for entry into college. The program is largely operated by colleges and universities, and typically consists of intensive summer sessions on a college campus for 10th- and 11th-grade students and followup programs of tutoring and after-schools sessions during the regular school year in order to sustain the

gains achieved during the summer experience. In operating Upward Bound programs, educational institutions are committed to assist each participant to gain admission to an appropriate postsecondary educational institution with the financial assistance he will need.

About 19,000 students were enrolled in 216 separate Upward Bound programs in the beginning of the summer of 1966, 4 percent of whom dropped out later that summer. The retention rate in the followup phase was 95.7 percent. An additional 3,000 students are enrolled this summer, in programs for which \$28.2 million have been expended, an increase of slightly more than \$2 million over the previous year. The cost per student for 1 year of Upward Bound has decreased from \$1,243 during 1966 to \$1,194 this year.

From 75 to 80 percent of Upward Bound enrollees enter college, which is a much higher rate than is known for youths of comparable background and achievement level. Reports of the first Upward Bound group, however, indicate a considerable dropout between the freshman and sophomore year. It is hoped that with better evaluative research, based on sufficient followup data and utilizing adequate control groups, remedies to this dropout problem will be provided.

4. *Other CAP Activities*

In addition to the current national emphasis programs—Headstart, legal services, comprehensive health centers, and Upward Bound—a variety of other programs is conducted by community action agencies. Some of the major ones are discussed below.

(a) *Neighborhood Centers*.—Most of the community action agencies have established neighborhood centers or rural equivalents. These centers provide for a variety of decentralized services, located conveniently so as to be easily accessible to the poor. Many of the staff positions are filled by neighborhood residents, and generally the center has a governing board or an advisory committee with a majority (61 percent on the average) consisting of residents of the area and members of the groups served. The challenge of combining the functions of services and resident participation in the neighborhood centers is to strike a balance. If the center is too heavily weighted toward neighborhood organization, established agencies whose services are needed are reluctant to participate, but if these agencies have a dominating role, residents will be less likely to use the services. Gradually over the past 2½ years, neighborhood centers at either extreme have been moving toward the middle ground.

(b) *Subprofessionals*.—One of the major contributions of the poverty program has been the utilization of poor people in subprofessional roles: that is, working as assistants to persons with professional training. Starting primarily as a means to achieve resident participation, this effort has evolved to a “new careers” program with a legislative base in the Scheuer amendment in 1966. Dozens and dozens of job categories have been ably filled by subprofessionals. Currently about 41,000 persons are so employed, not counting an additional 53,000 in summer Headstart. The average annual salary is \$4,100, and more than half are women. To further strengthen the subprofessional program, the committee recommends (a) a stronger effort should be made to hire more men and more older persons; (b) more and better training is needed; (c) career ladders should be established so as to provide avenues of occupational advancement; and (d) greater atten-

tion should be paid to opportunities for lateral transfer to jobs in the private sector and in other established public agencies.

(c) *Remedial Education and Tutorial Programs.*—During the first fiscal year under the Economic Opportunity Act, about half the funds went for remedial education and tutorial programs, many of which were delegated to local schools. This proportion fell after the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was enacted and was further reduced when OEO placed this program activity on its low-priority list in November 1966. Certainly primary responsibility for education should be placed with schools, but there remain certain tasks, particularly tutorial programs, which can be conducted by community action agencies and other organizations outside the schools. Thus, the committee believes that remedial education and tutorial programs continue to be an appropriate CAP activity as long as they complement and do not duplicate the work of the schools.

(d) *Adult Basic Education.*—The original Economic Opportunity Act contained an adult basic education program in title II, part B, but this was repealed in 1966 when a similar program was added to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In addition, OEO has funded a number of adult education programs under the general authority of the community action program. During fiscal 1967, \$18 million was allocated for this purpose, including \$7 million which was earmarked for this purpose by section 211-3, a 1966 amendment. In light of the continued high illiteracy among the poor, the committee believes that adult basic education should continue to be an eligible CAP activity but recommends that it be tied to a sequence of manpower training activities in order to obtain the greatest return.

(e) *Project Enable.*—Project Enable was a nationwide demonstration project funded by OEO and sponsored jointly by the National Urban League, the Family Service Association of America, and the Child Study Association of America. Project teams used discussion groups to reach poor families and to counsel them on family problems. This was done in 59 communities. During fiscal 1967, the continuation of Project Enable was left to the determination of each community, and with the limitation of "versatile" funds, many local sponsors were not refunded.

(f) *Family Planning.*—Many community action agencies have come to recognize that family planning is one of the most effective ways to combat poverty. According to a study made for the committee by Dr. Harold Sheppard, in the short run, at given income levels an increase in the number of children per family correspondingly increases the chances of a family to remain in, or move into, poverty. In the long run, a child born into a poor family has a greater chance of rising out of poverty as an adult if he has fewer brothers and sisters. Studies by OEO and other analyses show that family planning has one of the highest cost-benefit ratios of all the poverty programs. The committee believes that this program should be expanded.

(g) *Consumer Action.*—A number of studies have shown that the poor pay more and get less for goods and services than the nonpoor consumer. In response, community action agencies conduct a variety of consumer action programs, including consumer education, home management instruction, buying clubs, credit unions, consumer counseling services, and related legal services. These efforts have tended to be somewhat spotty and fragmented and rarely organized

to deal with the broad complexities of consumer problems facing the poor. The committee believes that consumer action efforts should be strengthened, with particular attention given to a more systematic approach.

(h) *Older Poor*.—The older poor are one of the most neglected groups of the war on poverty, in spite of repeated congressional urging for action. During the first year of the Economic Opportunity Act, the highly successful medicare alert program was conducted to inform older people about the availability of medicare. Since then the foster grandparents program, which assigns senior citizens to work in children's homes, and the Nelson amendment program, which undertakes beautification and conservation work, have provided new employment opportunities for the elderly. A number of the community action agencies have initiated programs designed to serve the older poor, but OEO has no complete record of these programs. In a special survey conducted for the committee, OEO found that of the 300 community action agencies responding, 90 have no programs for the older poor, 43 have special programs, and the rest attribute a portion of generalized services to the elderly; altogether \$6.8 million were allocated for such programs. Recently an assistant director for programs for the elderly was appointed but has not yet implemented the 1966 amendment requiring special studies and programs (sec. 610). Once again the committee must report an inadequate performance in programs for the elderly and urges OEO to take immediate steps to remedy this deficiency.

(i) *Rural Programs*.—Although more than 40 percent of the Nation's poor live in small towns, on farms, and in nonfarm rural areas, only 32 percent of the program funds were granted to such areas in fiscal 1967. It has been harder to organize community action agencies in rural areas, which lack sufficient service agencies and have difficulties of transportation. Nevertheless, 665 rural community action agencies have been established, encompassing 1,898 of the Nation's 2,464 rural counties. The most advanced ones are those which were started by existing organizations, such as economic development commissions, or were aided by strong technical assistance agencies. The rural programs have many of the same components as their urban counterparts—Headstart, Neighborhood Youth Corps, adult basic education, manpower training—but they also add activities related to the rural economy. The committee believes that the rural program should be strengthened and expanded. This would benefit both rural and urban areas because some of the urban problems have their roots in rural poverty, which induces migration into urban ghettos. Rural areas should receive a more equitable share of financing, and more technical assistance and personnel training should be made available to rural community action agencies.

(j) *Indians*.—About 240,000, or 80 percent of, reservation Indians are poor, and to respond to their needs OEO has created an Indian Division. During the first 2½ years of the program, \$37 million has been allocated to the Indian program, and this amount has been spent for a wide variety of programs. The programs are operated by the tribal councils, which are given the most self-determination ever provided Indians in the utilization of Federal funds. As Domingo Montoya of the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico told the committee, "The programs have afforded our Indian communities an opportunity

to become self-reliant in the respect that they have found they could manage programs through local control and participation." The tribal councils receive technical assistance from a three-university consortium sponsored by the Arizona State University, the University of South Dakota, and the University of Utah. The committee is favorably impressed by the progress of certain aspects of the Indian poverty program, particularly its emphasis upon self-determination. However, there is some lack of understanding of which programs will have the greatest impact on poverty and a notable absence of programs for economic development and small business assistance, which are needed in order to get at a fundamental cause of Indian poverty.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Purpose*

The committee bill seeks to clarify the purpose of the community action program. The Federal role should be to assist communities, with the communities having major responsibility for carrying out their own programs. The focus of such programs should be upon opportunity and self-help. A full range of opportunities should be opened to the poor, and obstacles which block opportunities should be eliminated. The ultimate goal is to enable low-income persons to achieve self-sufficiency. In short, the community action program should move poor people through their own efforts into the mainstream of American life (sec. 201).

To achieve this purpose, communities should be encouraged and assisted to provide direct services, promote improvements in service agencies, and mobilize public and private resources. A major program focus should be upon providing those services which help poor people to achieve economic independence, improve their living conditions, and increase their participation in community activities; this would get at the personal causes of poverty. Another focus should be upon improving the way in which the agencies and institutions of society serve the poor; this would deal with some of the social causes of poverty. A third focus should be upon mobilizing and coordinating a full array of public and private resources which together can open opportunities for the poor; this would result in building an effective community system for the elimination of poverty (sec. 202(a)).

2. *Resident Participation*

The requirement for resident participation has been one of the most significant innovations of the Economic Opportunity Act, for it has enabled thousands of poor persons to achieve a fuller role in community life. It has also been one of the most controversial requirements, and perhaps one of the most misunderstood. In the original act, this was a general requirement with no specificity, and the record is bare of congressional intent. But after nearly 3 years of experience, a number of methods for implementing this requirement have become clear, and these are written into the committee bill.

First of all, the bill retains the requirement to achieve "maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served." In addition to the original list of planning (or development), conduct, and administration as points for resident participation, the bill adds "evaluation," in keeping with other provisions to strengthen program evaluation (sec. 202(b)).

Secondly, the bill states that residents of the area and members of the groups served must be represented on the governing board of the community action agency. OEO has required this since the spring of 1965, and a 1966 amendment requires a minimum of one-third, a proportion which is maintained in the bill (sec. 213).

Thirdly, the bill promotes the hiring of residents as staff members. This, too, has been done since the beginning of the program. The bill strengthens this practice by requiring not only maximum employment opportunity for residents but also opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement. In addition, the Director should encourage employment of residents who are 55 and older (sec. 222).

Fourthly, the bill contains a new provision which encourages the use of delegate agencies which are neighborhood based and which have at least one-half of the governing board composed of residents of the area and members of the groups served. Such delegate agencies would conduct specific components within the framework of the over-all program. In addition, other delegate agencies, such as public agencies and the established voluntary social welfare agencies, would be required to establish effective procedures by which persons served would be able to influence the character of programs affecting their interests (sec. 215).

In addition to these four methods contained in the bill, some communities have developed other techniques as they have exercised local initiative in implementing the requirement for resident participation. These include neighborhood surveys, public forums, newsletters, and neighborhood organization. How the latter is done is of particular concern to the committee and requires clarification.

One of the basic reasons for requiring resident participation is to encourage people to help themselves. An important method of promoting self-help is for a community action agency to provide technical guidance and consultation to residents so that they can be assisted to organize block groups and neighborhood associations. Such citizen groups can study neighborhood problems, recommend solutions, and take action to put these solutions into effect. Experience shows that the greatest success comes through focusing on specific problems and programs rather than on abstract objectives, such as "power."

What the citizens do on their own is their business. Of concern, though, are the practices of staff who are paid by Government funds. In keeping with the concept of self-help, the primary role of staff is to serve as an enabler and to give assistance on such technical matters as obtaining a meetingplace, getting out meeting announcements, agendas, and minutes, conducting leadership training sessions, preparing background material, and upon request advising the group on program substance and action strategy.

In assisting citizen groups, it is improper for staff to make decisions for the people. It is up to the citizens to identify the problems of concern, with the staff, if requested, supplying statistics and other information that might be useful. It is up to the citizens to decide what solutions to recommend, with the staff, if requested, suggesting different possibilities and stating pros and cons of each. It is up to the citizens to decide what course of action to follow, with the staff, if requested, indicating alternatives and describing the advantages and disadvantages of each.

If the citizens decide to exercise their freedom of speech and make demands upon local government, or even upon the community action agency itself, it is their decision. If the citizens decide to exercise their right to assemble peaceably and petition the government for redress of grievances, it is their decision. Since it is the citizens acting for themselves it is not necessary, and is perhaps unwise, for staff to take part in social action activities. Certainly staff should not act as spokesmen for citizen groups, for the concept of self-help is destroyed if staff takes over roles which properly belong to the citizens. In sum, it is the people themselves and not staff paid by Government funds who are acting.

In clarifying the methods of resident participation, the Director should utilize his existing powers by placing conditions on the use of funds in order to prohibit certain activities. Government funds should not be used to print and distribute inflammatory literature which might incite civil disorder. (Our cherished freedom places very few restrictions on the spoken and written word, but what is supported by Government funds might be more restrictive.) Nor should Government funds be used to assist organizations whose major purpose is to develop monolithic power for a single racial or ethnic group or to pursue a course of action contributing to intergroup disharmony.

Although these prohibitions may be necessary, OEO should stress the positive methods of resident participation and should provide technical assistance and staff training so that poor citizens can have an effective place in community affairs.

3. Local Initiative

The bill requires that maximum emphasis shall be placed upon local initiative and responsibility (sec. 201(b)). This responds to the strongest theme which emerged from the committee's hearings. The United States is a nation of great diversity, and there must be considerable adaptability to deal with the different problems of New England, the older cities of the eastern seaboard, Appalachia, the South, the industrial cities of the Great Lakes, the Great Plains, and Mountain States, the Southwest, Indian reservations, the agricultural districts of the West, the sprawling poor neighborhoods of the newer western cities, the unique situations of Alaska, Hawaii, and the territories. Made-in-Washington solutions can never fully cope with such great diversity. Local initiative and local responsibility are of crucial importance.

This was the original intent of the community action program, as President Johnson emphasized in his first poverty message to Congress in March 1964:

This program asks men and women throughout the country to prepare long-range plans for the attack on poverty in their own local communities. These are not plans prepared in Washington and imposed upon hundreds of different situations. They are based on the fact that local citizens best understand their own problems, and know best how to deal with those problems.

This commitment to local initiative was endorsed by both Houses of Congress and by the newly formed Office of Economic Opportunity, which described the community action program as "a hometown fight."

However, Congress, OEO, and the administration have all been impatient with the slow pace, the unevenness of local capability, and the occasional controversy which are inevitably part of locally initiated programs. Thus, a series of national emphasis programs, started initially to assist newly formed local agencies, have come to dominate the program as first OEO and then Congress earmarked funds. In addition, OEO in November 1966 issued a memorandum defining high and low priorities and ordering regional office staff: "Cull out low-priority and low-quality projects." And this they did, with little regard as to whether a specific project was necessary for a particular community.

To be sure, there is a national interest in how community action funds are spent. Yet, of the total \$25.6 billion in the President's proposed 1968 budget for programs directly aiding the poor, only the \$1,022 million requested for the community action program offer communities an opportunity to make significant program adaptations which respond to local community needs. It is the "fine tuner" which brings national efforts into a sharp focus to respond to local needs.

The committee has concluded that local initiative not only needs to be emphasized but also to be built into the processes of the community action program. Therefore, the bill contains a provision which seeks to balance the national interest and local initiative by reserving 50 percent of title II funds for locally selected programs (sec. 220(d)). (This provision is explained in detail below.) At the same time, the committee recommends against any further congressional earmarking of funds for programs within title II.

4. Community Action Agencies

The bill retains the option to organize a community action agency as either a public agency or a private, nonprofit organization (sec. 210). More than 80 percent of the community action agencies are private bodies, but the committee's studies reveal that program effectiveness depends upon factors other than the legal form of organization.

The community action agency is given the specific role of serving as prime sponsor for financial assistance provided to a community under title II, with certain allowable exceptions. This responds to the committee's conclusion that the most effective coordination comes at the community level and that there needs to be a local coordinating instrument to fully mobilize and utilize all available public and private resources.

A community action agency is required to be capable of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating a community action program, with "evaluation" being a new function added by the bill. It must have adequate authority to administer funds, to transfer these to other agencies, and to contract with public and private organizations for the performance of specific functions; these powers make possible the use of delegate agencies. The Director may issue regulations to define more detailed criteria which community action agencies must meet.

5. Communities

The bill retains the basic provision of existing law to define the "community" served by a CAA. There is a trend toward the organization of multicounty community action agencies in rural areas, and a

metropolitan form of organization is often used in small and medium-sized metropolitan areas. This is generally a desirable practice, but where possible the service areas of such multicounty community action agencies should correspond to the boundaries of related programs, such as work and training (title I, pt. B), physical and economic development, and other program fields. To bring this about, the Director should consult with other Federal agencies and the States so as to achieve mutually agreeable, common or complementary boundaries for the planning of a variety of programs (sec. 211).

6. Statewide or Regional Agencies

The bill permits a statewide or regional agency to act as a community action agency to serve rural areas or small communities. Generally, this should be an interim operation which provides program coverage to unorganized communities until they can establish satisfactory local agencies. It should be done in a manner which contributes to the development of local capability. Such a statewide or regional agency should be broadly representative and should provide representation to residents of the areas and members of the groups served, but how this is achieved might differ from the methods used at the community level (sec. 212).

7. Governing Board

The governing board of the community action agency should be so organized that it will be able to carry out the basic objectives of the program, including the mobilization of public and private resources and the stimulation of improvements in related service agencies. It should be broadly representative of the community, and it should offer opportunity for membership to persons representing both the public and private sectors (sec. 213).

Since communities vary so greatly, it is not appropriate to have a single, national standard for board composition. Generally, though, it would be desirable to provide a place on the governing board for the chief elected official or his representative if he chooses to join this endeavor. For a multimunicipal or multicounty agency, an appropriate method of representation for the several local governments should be worked out even though considerations of size might preclude every unit being directly represented at all times. In a similar manner, ways should be found to provide appropriate representation to public and private agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor and to business, labor, religious, and other major groups and interests in the community. However, OEO should permit flexibility and local variation in board composition.

In some communities, the community action program is organized so that an overall, prime sponsor receives funds but delegates major responsibilities to multipurpose organizations which serve specific geographic areas and which in effect are miniature community action agencies. This might occur with multicounty agencies in rural areas, which have multipurpose, single-county delegate agencies, or in decentralized operations in large cities, such as New York, where there are community corporations for sizable districts. In such cases, these multipurpose delegate organizations should also be broadly representative of the subcommunities which they serve.

The bill retains the 1966 amendment which requires that at least one-third of the membership of the board shall be persons who are

selected by residents of the area and members of the groups served. The committee has found that in some communities all residents of a poor neighborhood are eligible to participate in the selection process, whereas in other places only low-income persons do; that in some communities representatives are themselves poor, but in other places the poor prefer to choose whom they consider to be their best spokesman, regardless of income. Such variation is acceptable and proper as long as poor persons have a full opportunity to participate in the selection process. Where substantial numbers of poor persons live outside neighborhoods where poverty is concentrated, they should be provided representation on the governing board; this is sometimes the case with the elderly poor and rural residents in particular. If a minority group makes up a major portion of the poor in the community, there should be assurance that it is adequately represented on the broadly representative governing board.

In carrying out the 1966 amendment, OEO has suggested the following methods of selection, and these are acceptable to the committee:

1. Nominations and elections, either within neighborhoods or within the community as a whole.
2. Selection at a meeting or conference to which all neighborhood residents, and especially those who are poor, are invited.
3. Selection of representatives to a community-wide board by members of neighborhood or subarea boards who are themselves selected by neighborhood or subarea residents.
4. Selection of representatives on a small area basis (such as a city block) who in turn select a neighborhood group that in turn selects members for a community-wide board.
5. Selection of representatives, either directly or for membership on a neighborhood board, by existing organizations whose membership is predominately composed of poor persons.

In addition, other methods might be devised if they meet the spirit of selection by residents and those served. However, appointment by a public official or an officer of a community action agency is not acceptable even if residents are consulted for nominations. Residents and those served must have the final say as to who represents them.

As another safeguard for adequate representation, the bill retains the provision requiring procedures for petitioning for representation by groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented. The bill also provides that community agencies may also so petition.

8. Powers of Governing Board

The committee bill spells out for the first time the powers and functions of the governing board (sec. 214). These relate to personnel policies, fiscal control, approval of overall plans, adoption and enforcement of program policies, approval of all proposals for financial assistance under this title, and periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of the program.

Community action agencies have already adopted personnel policies, as required by the administrative regulations of OEO, and have developed fiscal controls in responding both to OEO administrative regulations and to recent amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. Generally, these policies should be continued through the detailed administrative requirements of OEO, although the committee has

refrained from writing such details into the act. However, flexibility should be assured so that where the community action agency is a public agency, existing civil service requirements and public fiscal procedures could be considered adequate to meet these standards. Also, flexibility is needed in order to correspond to the customary method of appointment of staff in local agencies.

In exercising its power to adopt all program policies and approve all applications for assistance, the community action governing board should act in the spirit of community action, particularly the achievement of maximum feasible participation of the poor. This means that adoption of program policies must not be pro forma but must be based upon a background of broad involvement of the poor in the development of program ideas with adequate time provided for review of program proposals. The pressure of a Federal deadline for an application is not an acceptable excuse for bypassing the full involvement of board members, particularly those who represent the poor.

9. Delegate Agencies

The bill encourages the use of delegate agencies to carry out components of the community action program (sec. 215). This represents the general practice now, and it is desirable so that the community action agency can give full attention to its planning and coordinating role and not become a monolithic operating agency. The CAA should, however, have the option of operating programs directly if no other acceptable sponsor is available or if it would promote other objectives, such as institutional change.

A delegate agency may be either a public or private organization. It would fall into one of two categories, based upon the pattern of resident participation. The first category would include neighborhood-based organizations formed, in keeping with the emphasis on self-help, to carry out programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, and they should be encouraged to have governing boards with at least half the members composed of residents of the area and members of the groups served. The other category of delegate agencies would be the more established agencies, both public and private (municipal departments, united fund agencies, etc.), and they would be required to establish effective procedures to give residents and persons served an opportunity to influence the character of the program. This might be done through program advisory committees, parent groups, public meetings, and in some cases representation on the governing board, although the latter is not always practicable (such as with a public agency like the board of education) and therefore is not made mandatory.

The bill also encourages the formation of one specific type of delegate agency, housing development and service corporation organizations (sec. 215(b)). These organizations, which could be corporations, would be conduits for existing brick-and-mortar programs, whether administered by Federal, State or local governments or private agencies. The organizations would be prohibited from duplicating any of the credit machinery of existing programs, and would consequently be restricted to providing technical assistance, pump-priming and services.

Experts in the housing field, and particularly in the low-income housing field, have pointed out the need for upgrading the quality of low-income housing sponsors. The establishment of the organizations

envisioned by this section is one way of raising both the number and the quality of these sponsors.

10. Financial Assistance

The bill divides the financial assistance available to community action agencies into two main categories: general (sec. 220) and national emphasis (sec. 221). At least half of title II funds must be reserved for general assistance, which shall be used to finance programs locally selected to respond to particular community needs (sec. 220(d)). These might be either locally designed programs or national emphasis programs selected by the community for local emphasis. The way the fund allocation would work might be somewhat as follows:

Assuming an authorization and appropriation of \$1,062 million, as provided in the committee bill, \$531 million would be used for general assistance for locally selected programs. Such funds would be allocated among the States according to the allocation formula (sec. 224). Each community would decide how to use its share, and this might be a combination of (a) locally designed projects and (b) national emphasis programs selected by the community above any special allocation by OEO. The Director would be entitled to review the substance of the local programs for conformity with the purposes of the act, but he could not establish national binding priorities, as was practiced this past year by OEO. The remaining \$531 million would be allocated in a manner determined by the Director.

The committee realizes that the legislative process in enacting these amendments and in approving an appropriation may not be completed until October or November, well into the fiscal year. However, implementation of section 220(d) should not disrupt on-going programs since the local selection provisions would permit the selection of both programs authorized for general financial assistance and those authorized as national emphasis programs. The Committee also urges the Office of Economic Opportunity to stress to the community action agencies the importance of developing management and technical program capability.

11. Eligible Activities

In addition to national emphasis programs, the community action agency would be able to receive financial assistance for a variety of other activities which meet the purpose of the community action program; that is, which help poor persons to make progress toward self-sufficiency (sec. 220(a)). There might be programs in the fields of manpower training and employment, education, consumer education, housing and neighborhood improvement, family planning, narcotics addiction and alcoholism prevention and rehabilitation and emergency assistance. These might also include services to help persons remove obstacles and solve personal and family problems which block the achievement of self-sufficiency; that is, supportive services such as family counseling, health services, homemaking education, and restorative services for juvenile delinquents and criminals. A general service program, however, is not intended—only those activities which are means to the goal of self-sufficiency. Suitable activities may also be conducted to help poor persons achieve greater participation in the affairs of the community so that they will have a greater stake and feel more a part of community life. Activities may also be

used as a means toward assisting poor people to make more frequent and effective use of other related programs; a multipurpose neighborhood center which brings a variety of related services to a neighborhood is such an example. Appropriate programs for the elderly are eligible activities and should be encouraged. The Director may also provide financial assistance to organizations other than community action agencies to help them in planning for the establishment of new community action programs.

12. Systematic Approach

In order to assure that local programs are sharply focused upon clear-cut objectives, each community action agency must adopt a systematic approach to planning and implementation by July 1, 1968 (sec. 202(b)). It is not intended that a community has to have a completed and published document called a "comprehensive plan" before it can begin to receive financial assistance, for experience with other programs has shown that this can too often lead to unnecessary delays which inhibit action. Rather what is required is a carefully designed process which clearly specifies action objectives and effectively links program components to one another. At the minimum, the least experienced community should present a consolidated application for funds relating components to one another rather than merely offering a string of disconnected projects, as is too often the case. The more experienced communities should be expected to tie together other financial resources beyond title II funds. In the most advanced communities, it is hoped that some broad long-range, comprehensive community action plans will emerge in the near future.

13. Independent Agencies

The committee is purposefully seeking to develop the strength of community action agencies by making them prime sponsors and requiring a more systematic approach to planning and action. At the same time, it is necessary to build in safeguards to assure that the national interest is not thwarted by a process which is too complicated or has too many roadblocks to permit the funding of significant local projects. This is particularly true of projects designed by grassroots organizations which might not always receive financial support from community action agencies. Therefore, the Director is authorized and encouraged to provide financial assistance directly to independent agencies if it would enhance program participation or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the overall purpose of the community action program. (Sec. 220(c).)

14. Federal Review

It is expected that each application for assistance will be reviewed on its merits by the Director, and he may adopt appropriate criteria to form the basis for such review (sec. 220(e)). However, in keeping with the need for local initiative and responsibility, the Director may not establish binding national priorities which preclude a consideration of local needs. The committee's intent is to prohibit OEO from repeating the practice of the past year when communities were told to terminate such programs as remedial education, homemaking services, and meals for the elderly poor, when often there were substantial local reasons for continuing those programs. The Director is entitled to disapprove local applications when they fail to meet

established criteria but not to declare a blanket disapproval in a manner which deprives communities of their local initiative.

15. *National Emphasis Programs*

The bill provides for national emphasis programs, and specifies seven: Headstart, Follow Through, Legal Services, Comprehensive Health Services, Upward Bound, Project Find, and Family Planning. Headstart, Legal Services, and Comprehensive Health Services are continued from last year's amendments. Upward Bound has operated for 2 years with the Director's discretionary funds and is now sufficiently proven to have statutory authorization. Follow Through is a new program designed to sustain and build upon the gains made in Headstart. Project Find (for the elderly) and Family Planning are programs which the committee believes should be promoted in the national interest. In addition, the Director is authorized to initiate other national emphasis programs designed to deal with needs of the poor which are common to a number of communities.

Financial assistance for these programs is required to be channeled through the community action agency wherever possible in keeping with its function as a prime sponsor. Exceptions would be where the community action agency does not wish to perform that role, where it does not have the capability, or where a CAA does not exist in that community. Upward Bound would be an exception from this requirement because most of the grants go directly to colleges and universities. Maximum use should be made of delegate agencies.

(a) *Headstart* is specifically authorized, including the basic elements of the present program, such as health, nutrition, education, social, and other services and parental participation. It is intended that its authority be broad enough to provide for varied preschool programs differing in length of day, term, and ages served (sec. 221 (b) (1)).

(b) *Follow Through* is a new program focused on the early school years. It builds on the experience of Headstart which shows that unless a systematic followthrough is made with children previously enrolled in Headstart and similar programs the gains made tend to fade away. The same concentration of comprehensive services as used in Headstart should be utilized in Follow Through. During fiscal year 1967, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education initiated a pilot "Follow Through" program which is being administered by the Office of Education on the basis of a memorandum of understanding between the two agencies. The memorandum provides that funds authorized by title II of the Economic Opportunity Act and delegated to the Office of Education are to be used for grants to local educational agencies for Follow Through projects. The committee bill has drawn up more explicit guidelines for the administration of all community action programs. Generally, all such programs within a community will operate under the general sponsorship of the community action agency for the community. The change made in the funding of community action programs will not alter the basic operation of the Follow Through program. Local educational agencies will submit applications through the appropriate community action agency which will forward the application to the Office of Education.

Final approval rests with the Commissioner, subject to the conditions of the memorandum of understanding with OEO. This arrangement would strengthen the local coordination of antipoverty programs by community action agencies. It would also provide much needed stimulation to local school systems, many of which are notably lacking in their capacity to adopt innovative approaches to meet the needs of children from poor families. However, the schools should have complete control over school curriculum. Since the community action agencies have now had considerable experience with citizen participation, they will be able to assist the schools to achieve more meaningful parental involvement and thus to help overcome negative attitudes toward education which often prevail among the poor (sec. 221(b)(2)).

(c) *The Legal Services Program* is continued and given a focus upon furthering the cause of justice among persons living in poverty (sec. 221(b)(2)). This can be achieved by mobilizing lawyers and legal institutions and by providing legal advice, representation, and education. Particular attention should be given to activities which establish legal precedents and make improvements in laws affecting large numbers of poor. In conducting the program, there must be lawyer-client relationships consistent with the best standards of the legal profession, and the local bar associations must be consulted in the development of project proposals.

(d) *The Comprehensive Health Services Program*, an amendment sponsored last year by Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts, is also continued (sec. 221(b)(3)). One aspect would be comprehensive health centers which offer a broad range of health services for the poor. These should be developed with the cooperation of public health agencies and local medical associations. The centers should serve primarily the needs of low-income individuals, but others may be served in emergency cases or pending a determination of eligibility.

A new component to the health services program is added in the bill (sec. 221(b)(3)(B)). It provides for financial assistance for projects which develop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health services for the poor. Toward this end, OEO is authorized to make arrangements for educational exchanges, studies, research, and instruction related to health services for the poor; to provide for stipends and fellowships which encourage and support both prospective and experienced health professionals; to make possible orientation courses and otherwise provide information to poor persons who wish to enter the health services field; to enlist the cooperation of professional organizations, academic institutions, foundations, and other organizations. In carrying out this provision, the Director should work closely with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General.

(e) *Upward Bound* is specified in legislation for the first time (sec. 221(b)(5)). It is a program designed to assist underachieving youths from low-income families who now have inadequate school preparation to prepare for and obtain post-high school education. Financial assistance for such projects may be provided directly to institutions of higher learning, but projects shall be closely coordinated with activities of community action agencies and with the Higher

Education Act of 1965, particularly Operation Talent Search, to assure that duplication does not occur.

(f) *Project Find* is added as a sixth national emphasis program (sec. 221 (b)(6)). The committee, in response to its analysis of comparative rates of progress out of poverty among different age groups, and also in response to what it has learned from field visits, witnesses, and documented reports, believes that OEO requires a formal mandate from Congress to place greater and more systematic emphasis on the problems of the elderly poor. While income is a major problem among the 5.3 million poor over 65, there is much that OEO nevertheless can do for them within the range of the agency's possible services under title II. Surveys of local community action agencies reveal that they have gradually been recognizing the need in their communities to "reach out" and assist the elderly poor (who constitute a disproportionate number of all the poor) in such problems as referral to otherwise available health, housing, legal, and many other services. A national emphasis program would enable the provision of technical assistance to CAA's for this and related purposes. In many cases, it is even possible to employ elderly poor men and women in concerted programs designed to help others. Because of the desirability of preventing the onset of even greater isolation and other serious problems of the elderly poor, the committee believes it wise to allow for the inclusion of older poor persons in this type of program before they approach the conventionally accepted "old" age of 65. The inclusion of poor persons 60 and older (who number about 1 million) would greatly improve the chances of eliminating many conditions that create or perpetuate the cycle of poverty among the elderly.

(g) *Family Planning* is made a national emphasis program in the committee's bill (sec. 221(b)(7)). Since 1960, no progress has been made in reducing the numbers of poor persons in large families. The committee has gathered sufficient data from government and private sources to conclude that (1) family planning has one of the highest cost-benefit ratios among all the various antipoverty measures; (2) poor families with small numbers of children have a greater probability of moving out of poverty than those with greater numbers; (3) children born in poor families with small numbers of children have a greater chance to become nonpoor adults than those born in poor families with greater numbers; (4) the vast majority of poor persons desires family planning assistance but in many instances they do not know how to avoid the "unwanted" child; and (5) such a program is feasible. Since the beginning of OEO, the agency has gradually increased its support of locally initiated family planning projects but in relation to the total need the current effort is miniscule. The agency has only recently employed one full-time professional staff worker for this purpose. By citing such a program as among the national emphasis programs to be highlighted under OEO's community action, the committee believes it will result in more concentrated staff recognition on the part of more local community action agencies that voluntary family planning is an indispensable element in any effective combination of measures to combat poverty (sec. 221(b)(7)).

The Director is authorized to reserve funds for national emphasis programs, within the limits set by the 50 percent reservation for locally selected programs, but there need not be a reservation for every program. Thus, a national emphasis program might consist of one or more program models which are easily implemented with a technical assistance staff to aid communities in getting the program underway but with the funding decision left to the communities from their general assistance funds. It is likely that the Director will reserve funds mainly for those activities which community action agencies are not likely to adopt in the magnitude which OEO considers desirable. Since the committee added two new national emphasis programs (family planning and Project Find) and provision for training and study in the field of health services for the poor, it also added \$40 million to the proposed authorization for title II. This additional sum is intended to be added to those sums which would otherwise be reserved for such activities under the proposed authorization.

16. Resident Employment

All component programs, whether they be provided through general assistance or as part of national emphasis programs, are required to provide maximum employment opportunities for residents of the areas and members of the groups served (sec. 222). Particular attention should be given to providing further occupational training and career advancement and to employment of persons 55 years and older.

17. Neighborhood Centers

Multipurpose neighborhood centers have developed as one of the most significant tools of the community action program. By bringing a wide variety of services closer to where the poor reside, the neighborhood center increases the use of such services. By having varied services under the same roof, coordination is easier to achieve and people can be served as "whole persons." By providing a role for neighborhood residents in center planning, policymaking, and operations, resident participation is enhanced. The intent of this amendment is to focus on the role of the community action program in the program management of neighborhood centers, and there is no intent to replace or duplicate the efforts of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which has a program for the construction of neighborhood centers. Quite obviously, the two programs must be closely interrelated.

18. Allotment of Funds

The allocation formula of the existing law is retained for general assistance or "local initiative" funds and for Headstart funds (sec. 224(a)). The Director may use this same formula for the other national emphasis programs or he may develop special criteria, but for no program may more than 12½ percent of the funds be used in any one State (sec. 224(b)).

19. Local Matching

The committee has restored the 90 percent Federal contribution which applied until June 30, 1967, under the existing law (sec. 224(c)). The evidence from public hearings was overwhelming that reduction to 80 percent would be most harmful in rural areas and small com-

munities where the program is just beginning to operate and where the program needs encouragement in order to achieve greater equity. The committee has added a provision to permit pooling of matching funds between title II and part B of title I. The existing maintenance of effort provision is retained (sec. 224(d)), but a clause has been added to assure that existing educational services in elementary and secondary schools will not be duplicated and that maximum use will be made of school facilities.

20. Technical Assistance

The bill continues the provisions for technical assistance, training of personnel, and the special assignment of OEO personnel to agencies which need assistance (sec. 230). These are vital functions to the poverty program. Personnel training is a continuing need throughout the country for subprofessionals, professionals, managers, and executive staffs of both community action agencies and delegate agencies. Technical assistance is most needed in rural areas and small communities and should be concentrated there.

21. Role of the States

The committee bill strengthens the role of the States in the poverty program (sec. 231). In addition to the task of technical assistance, which has been in the act from the beginning, the bill authorizes financial assistance for coordinating State activities related to the community action program. This will enable States to mobilize resources at the State level as the CAA's do locally. States are also given an advisory role to assist the Director and the Economic Opportunity Council. The State agency designated to provide technical assistance is given preference over other State agencies for other grants or contracts under this title. A new provision enables the joint funding of projects involving both State and Federal funds. To do so, the Director may enter into an agreement with a State agency, and this agreement shall define the conditions under which Federal funds may be utilized. The Governor's right to veto projects under titles I-B and II is retained, as is the Director's right to override under certain conditions.

22. Research and Pilot Projects

The bill continues the authority for research and pilot projects (sec. 232). Such efforts must be undertaken in the context of an overall plan, and this plan should be formulated in a manner which reduces to a minimum duplication with other Federal research and pilot programs. Before any contract of grant is approved for a pilot project in a community with a community action agency, the Director must consult with that agency. The committee bill requires OEO to develop and carry out pilot projects on four topics of great interest to the committee: programs for the elderly poor, rural programs, community-based efforts to prevent narcotics addiction and alcoholism and to rehabilitate addicts and alcoholics, and projects designed to encourage participation of private, profitmaking organizations in the community action program.

23. Evaluation

The bill places considerable emphasis upon the need for evaluation of the community action program and its components (sec. 233). This may be done by OEO directly or through contracts with independent organizations, and the committee looks with particular favor on the latter arrangement. The results of such evaluation must be published. In order to assist communities to evaluate their own programs and for OEO staff to review the effectiveness of local programs, the Director is required to develop and publish evaluation standards.

24. Rural Areas

The bill retains requirements of the original act for equitable distribution of assistance between urban and rural areas (sec. 240). Unfortunately, rural areas have yet to receive equity, and therefore the bill requires the Director to undertake special efforts to increase the effectiveness of rural community action programs. Among the steps which should be taken are these: the establishment of pilot projects for rural areas, the giving of preference to rural areas in the provisions of technical assistance and personnel training, the development of model programs which are easily adapted to rural communities, and the use of simplified procedures, forms, and guidelines for rural areas.

25. Fiscal Responsibility

The bill requires the Director to prescribe regulations to assure responsible administration by grantees, including adequate internal management controls, accounting requirements, and personnel standards (sec. 241). Some of these rules have been contained in previous amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, and it is intended that the substance of these previous amendments remain in the administrative regulations even though they do not appear in this revision of the act. However, the Director is urged to consult with representatives of community action agencies to review the contents of CAP Memo No. 23-A, for the committee has heard a number of complaints that the standards of this memo are too inflexible to deal with varying local situations. However, any revision should maintain an insistence on merit hiring but should not permit educational credentials alone to be the criteria for merit. Nepotism should be prohibited. Excessive salaries should be avoided, and salaries should relate to the demands of the job, the qualifications of the applicant, the usual salary level for similar work in the community, and the demands of the job market in which staff are recruited. Since certain fields of service have lagged behind other professions in salaries paid and since certain minority groups have been held back in remuneration, reasonable compensatory salary makeup should be permitted.

26. Audits

The bill requires an audit 3 months after the effective date of the first grant or contract of assistance to an organization. This will enable OEO to evaluate the adequacy of the accounting systems and internal management controls before serious difficulties get out of hand. Prime sponsors should be required to take on this responsibility

for delegate agencies. In addition, there should be an audit of each grant or contract at least once a year, and where expenditures are disallowed, OEO should take steps to recover the sums involved. Among other allowable methods would be a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share in a grant or contract then in effect or entered into within 12 months (sec. 242).

27. Special Limitations

The bill retains most of the special limitations of existing law, including payments to the poor for participation in board meetings; prohibition against OEO staff serving on boards of grantees; standards for family planning programs with emphasis on personal choice; prohibition of general or curricular aid to elementary or secondary education; and encouragement for the use of existing community facilities (sec. 243). The committee has purposefully eliminated the statutory restriction of \$15,000 on staff salaries, for its studies and hearings have revealed that this restriction is a considerable handicap in attracting and maintaining the caliber of personnel needed for some of the top positions in the community action program. However, community action agencies and delegate agencies are expected to avoid paying excessive salaries, and OEO should handle this matter by regulation.

28. Educational Services

The reported bill would make many changes in the community action program. Among these changes is a restatement of the purpose of title II, to focus community action programs on the objective of enabling "low-income persons to achieve self-sufficiency." In line with this purpose the basic authority of the program has been tailored to provide the poor with the skills and knowledge necessary to achieve self-sufficiency. Education is inherent in providing persons with skills and knowledge. This is reflected in section 221 of the act which provides that financial assistance may support activities designed to assist participants in attaining "an adequate education."

The availability of financial assistance from the Office of Economic Opportunity for the education of the poor has raised a number of questions as to the relationships which are to be established with the U.S. Office of Education and with State educational agencies and local schools. With regard to this question, present law clearly prohibits community action program assistance for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system. The committee amended this provision to limit financial assistance in the educational field to noncurricular educational services as special health, remedial, and welfare services.

This limitation must be viewed in light of the fact that there are other funds available for the education of disadvantaged children. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes about \$2.4 billion for programs for educationally deprived children. The committee does not intend that funds from the Economic Opportunity Act be used to duplicate or compete with programs funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The

coordination language in title VI is designed to insure that Federal programs be carried out efficiently and without duplication.

Community action funds may be used to make the services of school social workers and psychologists, nurses and doctors, speech therapists, and education specialists (such as remedial reading specialists) available to poor children when such children have a special need for those services. However, those funds may not be used to hire teachers or instructional personnel for schools. This can be and is being done with funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The role of the Office of Education in the Nation's education program may be described as one of increasing educational opportunities by improving the quality of education offered by school systems as institutions. The Economic Opportunity Act is designed to increase opportunities for poor children. This necessarily involves improving educational services. The institutional approach of the Federal anti-poverty legislation converge in improving the educational opportunities for disadvantaged children. If duplication is to be avoided and if efficiency and coordination are to be attained, a distinction must be drawn where the two approaches meet—with the child. Poverty programs are intended to supplement education programs and therefore are limited to noncurricular educational services. Varying circumstances in the schools across the country do not permit a clear distinction to be drawn as to which services are noncurricular. The Committee feels, however, that for the purposes of this program, curricular education, as distinguished from noncurricular educational services, should be defined, subject to the above discussion, as those aspects of education which are offered as part of the normal school program in the area to be served.

The committee bill includes three provisions which are designed to insure that (1) Federal, State, and local education programs and the community action programs will be mutually complementary and will not be duplicative or competitive, and (2) Federal support of educational institutions will continue to be within the purview of the Office of Education. These amendments provide that—

(1) educational services provided with community action program funds will be noncurricular in nature (sec. 243(4));

(2) in extending such educational services, there will be maximum use of the services and facilities of the Office of Education and State and local educational agencies (sec. 243(6)); and

(3) where an agency offers inschool educational services which can be expanded or adapted to meet more effectively the educational needs of poor children and the purposes for which assistance is being extended under the community action program, the agency providing such services will be utilized in providing the extended assistance (sec. 224(d)(2)).

VIII. RURAL LOAN PROGRAM

"These loans have enabled the individuals as well as the cooperatives to remain in farming pursuits, and has in our opinion been extremely successful."—O. H. Simmons, Mississippi State Employment Security Commission.

A. FINDINGS

The purpose of the rural loan program is to help raise and maintain the income and living standards of low-income rural families. The program has been delegated to the Department of Agriculture and is run by the Farmers Home Administration (FHA). Loans are made to individuals and cooperative associations.

Individual loans assist poor farm families headed by persons handicapped by age, lack of education, or physical disability to improve their capacity to earn more, develop their limited farm resources, and live better as a family. Loans may be used to finance any operating costs, capital items, and real estate purchases and improvements connected with the borrower's farm or other enterprise that will increase his income-earning potential. Individual loans may be made up to an outstanding principal indebtedness of \$3,500, for a maximum term of 15 years, at a $4\frac{1}{8}$ -percent interest rate.

The cooperative loan program enables poor rural families to organize and operate cooperative organizations that add to earnings, conserve income, and teach mutual self-help. Such loans may be used for basic capital items such as land, building, and other real estate purposes; to provide operating capital, to pay costs of organizing and refinancing certain debts. Loans to cooperatives have a maximum term of 30 years, and the interest rate is $4\frac{1}{8}$ percent.

During the first $2\frac{1}{2}$ years of operations, 44,498 individual loans totaling \$74.3 million have been made, and 856 loans to cooperatives totaling \$9.7 million. Of the individual borrowers, 69 percent have been white, 25 percent Negro, and 6 percent other races, although in the Southern States 43 percent have been Negro. Seventy percent of the borrowers have 8 years or less in education. Half are 46 years of age or older, and half have five or more family members. Their gross annual income has averaged about \$2,600 at the time of the loans. Thus, the program is reaching those for whom it is intended.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The rural loan program requires only one substantive amendment. This is to have the loans made on the basis of "aggregate principal indebtedness" of no more than \$3,500, with the word "principal" added so as to exclude outstanding interest as part of the debt limit. This change is made because of the difficulty in determining the limit on a current basis so long as accrued interest must be taken into account. (sec. 302(a)).

An additional obligational authority of \$20 million is authorized by the committee bill (sec. 2). However, another estimated \$12 million will also be available from payments of principal and interest on previous loans. This will make possible \$27 million in individual loans and \$5 million in cooperative loans.

IX. MIGRANT PROGRAM

"The aim is to provide skills so they can do other work and provide them with a wider variety of skills to make them better workers off and on the farm, hopefully to be able to command a higher wage."—Mr. José Olivarez, a seasonal farmworker in New Mexico.

A. FINDINGS

1. *Description*

Title III, part B of the Economic Opportunity Act established a special program for migratory workers and other seasonal farm laborers and their families. Programs are authorized in the fields of housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children.

Housing is a major problem among migrant workers. For example, members of the committee saw families living in automobiles and tents along dry ditch banks in California, and similar problems exist in other States. During the first year of the program, OEO provided assistance which permitted the construction of 1,600 units of temporary housing, and with turnover about 16,000 people occupy these units each year. However, this effort was discontinued the second year because of high maintenance costs (\$1 million) and because OEO believes that temporary housing does little to eliminate farmworker poverty. Instead, the housing effort is now concentrated on self-help housing programs in which OEO provides technical assistance and training, the farmworkers provide land and labor, and the Farmers Home Administration provides long-term, low-interest loans. Eight hundred units of self-help housing were built or under construction during the past year.

Educational programs have been provided for all ages. Since children accompanying migrant families are not regularly enrolled in school, they tend to fall behind other youngsters of the same age. During the past year, OEO funded educational programs which reached 45,000 children and youth. For adults, the educational activities concentrate on basic literacy and occupational training so that as the need for seasonal farm labor decreases these workers will be able to qualify for other types of employment. Twenty-eight thousand adults were served with such programs this past year.

Day care for young children is another major need for migrant families since often fathers, mothers, and older children work in the fields. OEO-assisted day-care programs provide medical and dental care, balanced meals, and preschool education. They have many of the same features of Headstart but operate longer hours. Current programs are reaching 13,000.

During the 1967 fiscal year, the \$33 million provided for the program for migratory workers and other seasonal farm laborers were allocated as follows: permanent housing, \$2 million; temporary housing, \$1 million; youth education, \$9 million; adult education, \$17 million; day care, \$4 million.

2. *Evaluation*

The committee believes that this program is meeting a long neglected need. However, the resources so far committed are vastly inadequate. There are approximately 400,000 migratory workers and about 1.5

million seasonal farm laborers; with their families they total 7.5 million persons. Although all of these may not be in need of service, OEO has reached fewer than 2 percent.

As with other poverty groups, there is no overall Federal strategy or long-range plan for dealing with the problems of the migrants and seasonal farmworkers. As a result, decisions tend to be on an ad hoc basis. For example, temporary housing programs have been terminated even though for at least another 10 years and probably longer, farmworkers and their families will continue to move in the migrant stream.

The efforts to assist seasonal farmworkers to obtain literacy and occupational skills is a desirable effort, but it is not sufficiently connected to other Federal manpower programs. In New Mexico, for example, the committee found that graduates from the migrant adult education program were not accepted by the manpower development and training program because they did not meet MDTA entry requirements.

These criticisms do not negate the need for the program but rather suggest improvements which should be made.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee bill provides more specific authorization for the program for migrants and other seasonally employed farmworkers and their families. The bill extends the types of programs eligible for assistance, to include day care for children, education, health services, improved housing and sanitation, legal advice and representation, and consumer training and counseling (sec. 313). Emergency and temporary housing and sanitation facilities are permitted and should be made available where appropriate. Encouragement should be given to promoting increased community acceptance of such persons. Particular emphasis should be placed on education and occupational training to respond to the changing demands in agricultural employment. Provision is made for technical assistance and evaluation of projects (sec. 314).

X. SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAM

"The only way that we will be able to have an effective economic opportunities loan program is when the program will go back into the communities, when the program in the communities can go out to the people and serve the people of the communities."—Julius Hernandez, executive director, Lower Manhattan Small Business Development Opportunities Corp.

A. FINDINGS

Title IV of the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act contained a program "to assist in the establishment, preservation, and strengthening of small business concerns and improve the managerial skills employed in such enterprises." The program had two parts: Economic opportunity loans, which were handled by the Small Business Administration, and small business development centers, which were sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

1. Small Business Development Centers.

The small business development centers (SBDC's) were organized locally by community action agencies; and at one time 50 were in operation. The SBDC's, which were generally located in poverty areas, included in their functions the identification of candidates for training and/or loans; recommending specific loans for SBA approval; and organizing and providing management counseling and training to loan recipients and others. The SBA made final decisions on the award of loans, and it "serviced" loans to insure compliance with statutory and loan provisions.

In the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966 the program was transferred wholly to SBA. SBA then announced that the SBDC's would be closed and the program handled directly by SBA offices.

The reasons given by OEO for abandoning the EOL program were that there was no money to set up more SBDC's, that other programs were more important, and that the whole thing could be better handled by SBA. (The default rate was low and was not a factor.) Yet, where it was tried the program attracted many supporters. The program seems to have had successes in New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia. The last of the SBDC's were to have been closed by June 20, 1967, but the committee arranged for an extension until this legislation is enacted.

2. Economic Opportunity Loans

From January 1965 to November 1966, the economic opportunity loans were made through the small business development centers, and during that period 2,678 loans were made, totaling \$26 million in value. Beginning in December 1966, when the Small Business Administration took full charge, it was shifted to a nationwide program and began to serve other cities, suburbs, and small communities. From that date through June 1967, 2,222 loans were made, totaling \$25 million in value.

3. Evaluation

The loan program originally had too narrow a focus because it concentrated on persons at or not much above the poverty level, many of whom did not have the preparation to succeed in business. Later, the permitted income level was raised and emphasis was placed upon creating jobs for the unemployed, but this did not assure business success either and in many cases may have exposed struggling small businesses to unnecessary instabilities. The SBDC's in many communities provided useful services, but their participation in loan processing was a needless extra step. When the program was turned over to SBA, that agency decided to terminate the SBDC's but without substituting an adequate technical assistance program of its own. In the process of shifting to a nationwide program, the proportion of minority group businessmen assisted was sharply reduced although it is among this group that the need for assistance is greatest.

Although the original program had serious shortcomings, the committee is not satisfied with the changes which have occurred since the Small Business Administration took complete charge. The committee feels that an important priority of the antipoverty effort must be to expand the opportunities for a stake in community economic life for low-income persons and minority group members, especially in the urban ghettos. Therefore, the committee bill contains further changes.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Economic Opportunity Loans

The bill makes it clear that a major focus of the economic opportunity loan program should be small business concerns (1) located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or (2) owned by low-income individuals (sec. 401). To reinforce this change, the bill requires that at least 50 percent of the amounts of the loans shall be made in such areas or to such businesses (sec. 404). The bill permits a different definition of low income for this part than for other titles of the Economic Opportunity Act, so that a somewhat higher income level can be served. To assure that the loans will be well used, the committee bill requires that special attention be given to the development of management training and counseling programs in which borrowers may be required to participate.

2. Technical Assistance and Management Training

Responsibility for providing technical assistance and management training is shifted to the Secretary of Commerce, who is expected to assign this responsibility to the Economic Development Administration, an agency with considerable experience in this field (sec. 406). The Secretary would be authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private organizations, which in turn would assist small businesses. Eligible activities would include planning and research, identification, and development of new business opportunities, stimulation of new private capital resources, furnishing of centralized services, establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, encouraging placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small concerns located in poverty areas or owned by low-income individuals, and furnishing business counseling, management training, legal, and related services. Particular emphasis should be given to the establishment of management training and counseling programs of sufficient content to adequately prepare participants for the rigors of business competition; in the past, management training courses have been too brief and have been limited to rudimentary accounting and business skills which do not prepare an individual to compete on his own. The committee hopes that major new initiatives will be taken in this area. Special emphasis is to be given in this regard to enlisting the talents and personnel of existing businesses, including efforts to develop management training opportunities in existing businesses in an on-the-job format.

The Secretary of Commerce is in no way required to continue the existing SBDC's, although the committee expects that he may wish to continue funding such of those centers he finds to be effective.

Preference should be given to projects which promote ownership by residents of poverty areas and projects planned and carried out with participation of local businessmen. The Secretary of Commerce is required to work with other Federal agencies so that Federal contracts, subcontracts, and deposits are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this program. The committee expects that the Secretary of Commerce will use such funds provided pursuant to section 406 as may be necessary to add personnel needed by his department to implement this small business assistance program.

XI. DAY CARE PROGRAM

"The biggest problem in Rhode Island today is the lack of a large network of low-cost child-care services, for surely we cannot expect, nor do we want, mothers with dependent children to take advantage of the employment market when an almost complete lack of child-care services exists in the community."—Benjamin Farrell, president, Rhode Island Conference of Social Work.

A. FINDINGS

Poor families with female heads are one of the few poverty groups which have increased in size during the past 7 years. The number of children living in such families grew from 4 million in 1960 to 4.4 million in 1966. This increase occurred mostly among families with five or more children.

There are two means through which these families can escape poverty. One is through an income-maintenance program—by increasing payments under public assistance or by adopting an alternative program, such as a family allowance or negative income tax. The other is to provide training and employment opportunities so that the mothers are able to support their families, but to do this would require child-care services when the mother is at work.

The income maintenance approach has not been considered by the committee but the latter type of approach is within our current interest because the various training and job-creation programs contained in the committee bill will offer new opportunities to these women.

The committee believes that mothers should have a meaningful choice between adequate income support and employment, including combinations of the two. They should be neither forced to work nor denied the opportunity to gain employment. But if they choose to work, they should be assured that their children will receive proper care.

Throughout the country the committee has heard statements about the insufficiency of day-care programs. This testimony has come from civic leaders, professional social workers, and poor persons who would utilize such services if available. A modest program for Federal assistance for day care is contained in the Social Security Act, and Congress is considering amendments to expand this activity. However, this program is administered solely by Departments of Welfare and is aimed primarily at families which receive public assistance, and therefore excludes hundreds of thousands of poor families which could utilize a day-care program as a means of achieving self-sufficiency.

The committee, therefore, recommends a new day-care program as part B of title V of the Economic Opportunity Act.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. *Purpose*

The purpose of the program would be to provide day care for children from low-income families or other families residing in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons. This would enable parents or relatives of such children to undertake or continue vocational training, basic education, or

gainful employment. It is intended that the program focus primarily on children of those persons who are entering training and advancing to employment and that it should be used to fill the interstices not covered by other day-care programs (sec. 521).

2. Financial Assistance

The bill authorizes the Director to make grants to appropriate public agencies and private organizations for day-care programs, including health, education, social, and other supportive services, and the costs of renovation and alteration of physical facilities, if necessary (sec. 522 (a)). Federal assistance may not exceed 90 percent of the cost of such programs. If appropriate, such assistance may be provided in conjunction with or supplementary to other federally aided day-care programs.

3. Participants

Preference should be given to children from poor families or families in poverty areas whose parents or relatives desire to accept employment or to undertake vocational training or basic education under this act or related programs (sec. 522(c)). Where a family is not in the low-income category or through employment rises above the poverty line, that family may be charged part or all of the cost of services received (sec. 522(b)). This is permitted because the committee looks with favor upon a reasonable mixture of income levels and does not feel that a family should be barred from participation when, as a result of work, it is able to rise above the poverty line. Partial payment is allowable because some families cannot afford the full cost since their income will not be very far above the poverty line.

4. Training.

An expansion of day care in the United States will require additional trained personnel. To meet this need, the bill requires that training be provided to welfare recipients and other low-income persons so that they can fill the new jobs which are created.

XII. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING INCOME

A. FINDINGS

The intent of title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act is to provide incentives for persons receiving public assistance to participate in the training programs under the act. This was considered necessary and desirable because ordinarily under the public welfare program each dollar earned results in a reduction of a dollar of public assistance. Thus, there is no financial gain in trying to better oneself unless the income gained is more than the total welfare payment, but usually this would not be the case for training allowances.

The formula of existing law enables a trainee to retain the first \$85 of his training allowance with no reduction in public assistance and half of every dollar of training allowance thereafter. This formula is an improvement over a dollar-for-dollar reduction, but it has two shortcomings.

First, it is possible that a person might have some of his training allowance taken from him (the 50-percent reduction over \$85) while he is still below the poverty line, as defined by Federal agencies.

For example, consider a family of five with a poverty line of \$300 a month, a State welfare payment of \$150 a month, and a training allowance of \$125 a month for the household head participating in a training program; this family would lose \$20 a month of the training allowance (half of the amount over \$85) even though the total income with the full allowance would be only \$275; that is, \$25 below the poverty lines.

Second, the resident subprofessional poses a special problem. In many community action agencies, such persons fill positions which are a combination of work and training, and the persons are so engaged over a continuous period. Where the resident subprofessional works full time, he almost always receives more than the poverty line and more than he would from public assistance, unless he has a very large family which would merit higher welfare payments. However, some of these positions are filled by part-time workers and earnings alone would not place them above the poverty line; but if combined with welfare payments, the total income might be 50 percent or more above the poverty line and perhaps as much as twice the maximum welfare payment. OEO has handled this situation administratively by counting only the earnings up to \$150, with a dollar-for-dollar reduction in public assistance above that amount. However, this sharply reduces the incentive to earn more. OEO also limited the period of eligibility to 12 months whether or not the person would be above the poverty line without the combination of welfare and part-time earnings.

The committee is dissatisfied with the present law because of these shortcomings, and in its bill recommends a new approach.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATION

The committee bill revises title VII so that all trainees will receive their full training allowance or wages under the Economic Opportunity Act, known as "qualifying income," as long as their combined income does not exceed their poverty line. When the combined income exceeds the poverty line, the public assistance payment would be reduced at a rate which would permit the termination of assistance when the total family income is 25 percent above the poverty line.

Take, for example, the family of five with a poverty line of \$300 a month and a public assistance payment of \$150 a month. The first \$150 of qualifying income would not result in any reduction of welfare. From that point on, though, every increase in qualifying income would result in a 50-percent decrease in welfare payments so that when the qualifying income reached \$375, welfare payments would be down to zero.

Mathematically, the amendment is expressed as follows:

$$\frac{\text{PA(public assistance)} - 0.25 \text{ PL (poverty line)}}{\text{PA}} = \text{rate of reduction.}$$

For the family of five with a poverty line of \$300 a month, 0.25 PL equals ($0.25 \times \$300$) or \$75. For varying amounts of public assistance, the rate of reduction for this family would be as follows:

Public assistance:	Rate of reduction (percent)
\$100 per month-----	25
\$150 per month-----	50
\$200 per month-----	62.5
\$250 per month (70 percent)-----	66½

In the last instance, the maximum rate of 66½ described in the bill would apply, since the committee believes that any higher rate would serve as a disincentive. Under this arrangement, there would be no time limitation but instead public assistance payments would be terminated only when income has risen sufficiently.

XIII. VISTA

"We have had wonderful cooperation and help from VISTA's in not only helping us but obtaining sewing materials. Many people, poor people are beginning to see the worthwhile of these programs. I am proud to say that my own family has been able to obtain education endeavors, even within the poverty level."—Mrs. Chavez, a resident of Lovato, N. Mex.

A. FINDINGS

1. Purpose

Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) was established as part of the Office of Economic Opportunity to enable volunteers to participate in the war on poverty by living and working among poor people. The program has operated in a manner designed to both complement and supplement other antipoverty programs. Eighty-seven percent of the volunteers have been directly involved in OEO-related projects: 3 percent have been assigned to Job Corps centers, 35 percent to community action agencies, and 49 percent to other agencies which are funded whole or in part by the Economic Opportunity Act.

2. Projects

Currently, volunteers are serving on 412 projects in 48 States, (all but Kansas and Mississippi), the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. These projects include 160 in urban areas, 58 on Indian reservations, 17 in migrant programs, 118 in other rural projects, 44 with the Job Corps, and 15 in mental health programs. The enrollment of full-time volunteers was 4,257 on June 30, 1967.

3. Length of Service

Since the program's inception, 7,219 persons have served as volunteers. The term of service is 1 year. However, 1 out of 4 has extended his service for a second year, and another 9 percent have remained in service several months beyond the 1-year period.

4. Selection

Recruitment and selection of full-time volunteers is handled by VISTA directly. Initial screening is done by a computer, which rejects about 20 percent as unsuitable for VISTA service. VISTA staff then perform individual screening, and ultimately only 1 out of 6 applicants is accepted.

5. Training

VISTA contracts with universities and other institutions to train the volunteers before they enter the field. As of June 1, 1967, VISTA had conducted training programs at 42 institutions throughout the country with 165 training cycles in 29 States. Each site offered a specific type of training (e.g., the University of Alaska for work with Eskimos and the Harlem teams in New York City for urban slums). Each volunteer is given 2 weeks of generic training, which includes exposure to the debilitating conditions of poverty in general, and then 4 weeks' experience in the type of poverty area where he will be serving.

In response to earlier criticism that volunteer training was unrelated to subsequent service experience, VISTA has attempted to improve its training and placement system by placing volunteers in training centers located in the same geographic region and in a similar environment to the area in which they will serve (e.g., urban-slum training in Chicago will result in placement in an urban slum in the Great Lakes region). Where possible, VISTA will send the trainee, with a trainer, to his service location during the last 3 weeks of training.

Training classes range in size from 35 to 60, averaging 45 volunteers per class. The average cost per trainee has been \$1,000, but with the introduction of the new training-placement system, which reduces transportation costs, VISTA hopes to lower this to \$680.

6. Summer Associates

Last summer 498 VISTA associates served for a 10- to 12-week period in Appalachia. They were university students who aided full-time VISTA's in their efforts to ameliorate poverty in this area. During the summer of 1967 VISTA financed 1,500 associates who again served in Appalachia as well as in more than 20 other communities throughout the country, ranging from urban slum areas in New York City to Indian reservations in New Mexico.

7. Local Volunteers

A new program this year is the Citizens Volunteer Corps, which utilizes private citizens who cannot join regular VISTA programs but would like to donate their free time to perform VISTA volunteer activities in their home communities. As of June 30, 1967, 27,300 people were serving in the program.

8. Foreign Volunteers

VISTA, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development and the Institute of International Education, a private, non-profit foundation, also undertook a pilot training program this summer, at no expense to OEO, for 47 foreign students from 24 countries in Africa, South and Central America, South Asia, and the Middle East who are studying at colleges and universities in the United States under the auspices of a variety of scholarships. The 10-week program, run in conjunction with the VISTA associates, was designed to show these students how poverty is being combated in this country and to provide them with experience in community development work. It is hoped that these students will provide leadership for similar programs when they return to their own countries. These students were recruited by the Institute of International Education, paid for by AID, and assigned to projects in Washington, D.C., New York, N.Y., Boston, Mass., western Massachusetts, and northern New Mexico.

In addition, as part of the summer associates program, VISTA also trained 500 American college students who were selected and paid for by the Peace Corps, with the expectation that they would enter Peace Corps service next summer after graduation.

9. Evaluation

The committee has concluded that VISTA is making a valuable contribution to the poverty program. Volunteers are performing a wide variety of useful tasks which fill unmet needs, and the volunteers are gaining experience which will make them more useful citizens when they have completed their period of service. The administration of the program is steadily improving but continuing attention is needed to assure that the various elements, such as recruitment, selection, training, and field supervision, are interrelated, as they must be if the total program is to be effective.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The major change recommended by the committee is the addition of authorization for part-time, "hometown" volunteers. The bill also contains provisions to strengthen the present law, based upon 2½ years operating experience.

1. Full-Time Volunteers

The authority to establish programs for full-time volunteers is substantially unchanged from existing law (sec. 810). However, the provision for referral of volunteers (in contrast to assignment) to State and local projects has been deleted because it has proved infeasible to implement, but the authorization for part-time volunteers in their home communities embodies the original purpose of this provision. The bill requires a full-time personal commitment to combating poverty, including, where feasible, living among the people served (sec. 811). The 1-year term is spelled out although a shorter period (but not less than 2 months) is permitted in certain circumstances.

2. Support

The bill retains the provisions of existing law for volunteer stipends at a rate not to exceed \$50 per month and \$75 per month for volunteer leaders (sec. 812). It also retains the provision authorizing the Director to provide volunteers with living, travel, and leave allowances and housing supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, health, and medical care as necessary. The bill contains clarifying amendments to indicate that ordinarily stipends will be paid upon completion of a term of service. In addition, the Director is authorized to provide or arrange for educational training and counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to utilize their VISTA experience in combating poverty after their formal connection with the program has ended.

3. Community Service Programs

The bill authorizes the Director to encourage, develop, and assist new programs designed to increase and expand volunteer participation (sec. 820). These programs will utilize volunteers working part time, or for periods of less than 2 months' duration, in or near their home communities, in activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. They will be designed to encourage persons to participate,

as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under the Economic Opportunity Act; in programs to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional, or technical skills to contribute these skills to the betterment of neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations of poor persons; and in programs which assist existing national and local agencies and organizations to obtain services of volunteers more readily. It also authorizes the Director to provide special training for volunteers participating in such programs.

It should be noted that volunteers under this section would not receive any stipend, nor, except in unusual or special circumstances affecting their project, could they receive any other support or allowances. The section also provides that the value of the services of volunteers under this section, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal act, may be accepted toward provision of the non-Federal share.

4. Special Volunteers Programs

The bill retains existing authority for special demonstration projects, except for the VISTA associates, short-term projects which would be incorporated into the regular VISTA program (sec. 821). In view of this latter change, the limit on the portion of the title VIII funds which can be utilized for this section has been reduced from 15 to 10 percent.

5. Special Demonstration

The bill establishes a demonstration project to help young adult offenders (sec. 822). It provides that over the next 3 fiscal years, teams composed of VISTA volunteers and members of the Teacher Corps will be placed in no more than six prison facilities in or nearby six of our large cities. The purpose of the bill is to provide young adult criminal offenders with intensive education, training, and counseling during the 6 to 8 months prior to release from confinement and during the 6 to 8 months immediately following release. The teachers will be based at the prison facilities and each instructor will work with approximately 10 prisoners at a time. The VISTA volunteers will work in the community with caseloads of approximately four offenders who have previously received intensive training at the prisons. The teams of volunteers and teachers will receive close supervision not only from their own leaders but also from community-sponsoring groups composed of judges, prison and parole officials, and criminologists. The work of these teams will in no way conflict with the operations of local corrections departments; rather the activities of VISTA and its affiliated teachers will supplement existing programs. In short, those cities which desire to participate in this experimental project will have to offer close cooperation and assistance, but they will not have to disturb or change their ongoing correctional policies.

6. Coordination With Other Programs

The bill requires that VISTA be coordinated with the community action program and other appropriate Federal, State, local, and National programs (sec. 831).

7. Participation of Older Persons

The committee bill requires the Director to take steps to achieve greater participation of older volunteers and to encourage the develop-

ment of more projects which serve the needs of the older poor (sec. 832). The committee feels that, although VISTA has recruited a significant number of older persons to act as volunteers, it has developed almost no programs which directly serve the needs of older persons. The committee desires to see an acceleration in both areas. VISTA volunteers, whatever their age, should now serve the profound needs of aged, poor persons. It may be most desirable to develop programs utilizing older persons in service to other older persons. In this regard, the committee urges the greater utilization of older persons groups as sponsors of such projects and as sources of recruitment.

XIV. EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

"I believe in something for something. Now, I believe in giving a man an opportunity to earn some money."—Alphonzo Morris, New Bern, N.C., former welfare recipient and graduate of a federally aided manpower program.

A. FINDINGS

In the hearings held by the committee throughout the length and breadth of the continental United States, a clear consensus emerged that jobs are the single most important way to combat poverty.

Erwin D. Canham, editor-in-chief of the *Christian Science Monitor* and chairman of the Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, told the committee, "Expert after expert, when consulted by the task force, has emphasized that income and place in the social and economic scheme can best be restored by providing the employable poor with training and job opportunities. These have the effect of bringing them into the mainstream of the economy, rather than merely paying them to remain outside."

Andrew Biemiller, director of legislation, AFL-CIO, recommended: "As a major aspect of the war on want we urge the inauguration of federally supported job-creating programs that would put the hard core unemployed to work providing needed public facilities and services."

Bayard Rustin, civil rights leader and executive secretary of the A. Phillip Randolph Institute, stated, "The great majority of the people who are poor, I am convinced, want work, but that work won't be found until we are prepared to establish a full and fair employment economy. We need public services, which is one means of creating full employment."

John Reading, mayor of Oakland, Calif., reported, "When visiting the neighborhood center, I find that most of all, the people want jobs. I feel very strongly, and the ones around me feel very strongly, that if we can provide jobs that we in turn then, over a period of time, will to a great extent solve the rest of the social evils that apply to a poor city."

These leaders reflect the views of the American people. In a public opinion poll taken August 14, 1967, to determine what the people believe would be an effective way to deal with the urban crisis, Louis H. Harris & Associates, Inc., found that 69 percent of the public

favor setting up large-scale Federal work projects to give jobs to the unemployed.

The conclusion that jobs are the central need of the poor is well founded in statistics. In 1966 when the U.S. unemployment rate averaged 3.8 percent, the rate for the disadvantaged was much higher; for all Negroes, 7.3 percent; for all 16- to 19-year-old youths, 12.7 percent but for Negro youth, about 25 percent. The unemployment rate for those with 8 years or less of education tends to run twice the national average for all workers.

A survey of 10 urban slum areas conducted by the Labor Department in November 1966 found 1 out of 10 workers unemployed. Yet these figures do not tell the true story, for they do not reveal the extent of hidden unemployment. To get the whole picture it is necessary also to consider those with part-time jobs who want full-time work, those earning too little to meet their families' minimum subsistence needs, and those who could work but are not looking because they are discouraged at the prospects. Adding these to the traditional unemployment rate yields what the Labor Department calls the "subemployment" rate. In the 10 slum areas, this rate was 34 percent, or three times the usually reported unemployment rate for those areas.

In magnitude, the number unemployed and looking for work in the United States has averaged nearly 3 million during the first half of 1967. To reduce unemployment to a rate of 3 percent, which used to be the Federal goal, would take 600,000 new jobs. To take care of underemployment and hidden unemployment might take twice that number, and perhaps more.

Nonetheless, projecting the findings from the 10 slum areas to the Nation as a whole, the Labor Department concluded that, as bad as the problem is, it is of manageable proportions. Given more resources, the high rate of unemployment could be drastically reduced in a reasonable period of time. The committee is convinced that this would be true even with the addition of rural areas with severe unemployment, although the types of programs would vary some between urban and rural areas.

While a major part of the problem is the lack of job qualifications of the unemployed, no amount of training will solve the total problem unless the jobs are there. Conversely, if jobs are certain, training can be accelerated. As evidence, recall the illiterates who became production workers with only a few months on-the-job training during World War II.

The committee's amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, particularly to part B of title I, have expanded and strengthened the training programs for the disadvantaged. But this is not enough. The extent of unemployment in our inner city areas and in certain rural areas severely affected by technological change is such that a crisis exists. Emergency measures must be taken immediately. Federal funds should be invested now in creating jobs for the unemployed.

This reiterates what the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty recommended in 1964: "Federal, State, and local governments should undertake a joint program to directly employ the hard-core unemployed in poverty-stricken areas, both rural and urban, in an attack on the deficiencies of their own environments. Financial support should be provided by the Federal Govern-

ment. Local governments and private groups should provide the proposals, planning, and administration."

Since then, three Federal commissions appointed by the President have affirmed this recommendation. In February 1966, the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress recommended a 5-year program of public service employment with a sum of \$2 billion for the first year. In June 1966, the White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights" urged the development of "government-financed employment programs on public works and services to guarantee the availability of jobs to able workers who cannot be placed in, or promptly, trained for, regular employment." In July 1967, the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber proposed that Federal funds be granted to State and local governments and certain types of nonprofit institutions which would serve as "the residual employer" in rural areas with high unemployment until economic development programs can take hold.

Each of these bodies has identified public service employment as an especially fruitful source of additional, socially useful jobs. The "Automation" Commission, for example, estimated that at least 5.3 million such jobs could be filled: 1.2 million in medical institutions and health services, 1.1 million in educational institutions, 1.3 million in national beautification, 700,000 in welfare and home care, 350,000 in public protection, and 650,000 in urban renewal and sanitation. In a study conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity, Greenleigh Associates, Inc. calculated that it would be practicable to fill more than 400,000 such jobs during the first year of a new employment program.

The evidence is strong and consistent. Jobs are central to solving the crisis of cities and depressed rural areas. Public service employment provides an immediate remedy. Federal resources must be used, but the job creation programs should be locally operated. All that is lacking is the national commitment. To supply this missing link the committee recommends the adoption of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967.

B. LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATION

1. *Purpose*

The purpose of the proposed Emergency Employment Act is "to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest by fulfilling unmet needs" (sec. 202).

2. *Administration*

The act would be administered by the Secretary of Labor. He would have the option to delegate this task to the most appropriate agency in his Department such as the Manpower Administration, which now operates the manpower programs under the Economic Opportunity Act and other acts. To administer this program effectively will require considerable talent. The committee recommends, therefore, that sufficient supergrade positions be made available to the Department.

3. *Eligible Areas*

The act is intended to and specifically states that the program must serve both urban and rural areas, but to qualify, an area must contain

a high proportion of low-income families and individuals and have severe problems of unemployment and underemployment (sec. 203). Such areas may be defined without regard to political boundaries. The intent is that the program must be pinpointed to areas of intense need. In the cities, these are the poverty areas which are generally concentrated in the inner city. In rural areas, these tend to be the counties with high unemployment and outmigration due to technological change. Even though an urban program might be focused on part of the city, an appropriate citywide public or private agency may be used as the prime sponsor of the local program. In many rural areas it might be advantageous to utilize a multicounty agency as a prime sponsor.

4. Program Operators

Programs may be operated by either public agencies or private organizations, including profitmaking organizations under contract (sec. 204(a)). Preference should be given to local arrangements which can produce jobs quickly but which also have ties with the local manpower system in order to assure avenues for further training and job placement in competitive employment. Where possible, the program would be appropriately channeled through the prime sponsor of work and training programs required for title I, part B of the committee's amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act. However, if a community has difficulty in forming an effective prime sponsor, the Secretary should fund individual programs directly so as not to delay the creation of new jobs. Even with the use of a prime sponsor, the Secretary may reserve the right to fund directly an independent project which shows great promise of useful work activities for those in need but is not part of package developed by the prime sponsor. The aim should be expeditious action but with the realization that long-range considerations require programs which are linked to a total community manpower system.

5. Financial Assistance

The Secretary may provide financial assistance either in the form of grants or contracts (sec. 204(a)). Such assistance may be used to pay part or all of the costs of local programs, including wages and fringe benefits for participants, supervision and administration, education and training where necessary, supplies and equipment, but not capital expenditures except as part of a work project. A high proportion of project costs would go for participants' wages. Although training costs are permitted, where possible, other Federal training programs should be utilized to supply this component.

6. Local Initiative

There should be a maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility, particularly in determining areas of need, in selecting participants eligible for assistance, and in developing and selecting job opportunities and projects (sec. 204(a)). While it would be useful for the Department of Labor to develop model programs which could be easily adapted by local agencies, but these should not be imposed on localities nor be given preference over locally developed projects.

7. Requirements for Local Participation

Local sponsors must achieve full participation and gain the maximum cooperation of local public officials, residents of the areas served, and representatives of such private organizations as business, labor, civil rights, social welfare, and other groups concerned about employment opportunities (sec. 204(a)). The local sponsor must also assure that the emergency employment program is fully coordinated with other relevant programs, including the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. Particular attention should be given to the various housing and community facilities programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development in urban areas and the Department of Agriculture in rural areas so that the jobs made available under these programs can be fully utilized. The Secretary of Labor should take steps at the Washington level to promote coordination with these other Federal programs.

8. Types of Jobs

The Emergency Employment Act is intended to be primarily a job-creation program. Therefore priority must be given to projects which are labor intensive in character (sec. 204(b)). The jobs may be related to either services or supporting facilities. They may be in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such services and supporting facilities may be provided by public or private nonprofit agencies or by a private, profitmaking organization under contract. Regardless of the sponsor, the jobs should consist mainly of those which can be filled by the disadvantaged, including persons who are unable to find work in regular employment, and persons who are graduating from training programs (such as for "new careers") but for whom no relevant employment is available. In places with a chronic labor surplus, such as depressed rural areas, skilled workers may be unemployed, and they too may be served by this program.

9. Occupational Advancement

Strong efforts should be made to prevent the jobs created by this program from becoming deadend jobs. With that in mind, the Secretary may provide financial assistance for education, training, and supportive services which help participants prepare for regular competitive employment. He should also take steps to assure that job-creating activities are linked with other training programs (sec. 204(c)). Thus, title I, part B of the Economic Opportunity Act (as amended by the committee) could be used to provide basic education and supplementary training to persons involved in the emergency employment program. Such persons also might move into on-the-job training under the Manpower Development and Training Act. The Department of Labor should audit the performance of local sponsors to be certain that they are advancing participants to regular competitive employment as soon as practicable. However, this requirement should not be blindly enforced to force participants out of the program before other jobs are available.

10. Private Employment

The total program should have a strong private enterprise thrust. The Secretary should assure that maximum effort is made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons. As appropriate, he may provide financial assistance to achieve that goal, such as to organizations which provide information and technical assistance to business enterprises seeking to hire more of the disadvantaged.

11. Loans

Some of the potential public service projects are of a nature requiring a sizable investment in supplies and equipment. Such examples are sidewalk paving, playground construction, building of picnic facilities, rehabilitating and equipping day care centers, planting shrubs and trees in beautification projects. Although a reasonable expenditure for supplies and equipment may be made with funds provided by this act, this should not become excessive. It is likely that many local governments would be able and willing to provide supplementary funds for this part of project costs, either from the operating or capital budget; but since local budgets are adopted long before a new Federal program is enacted, there is inevitably a delay. For that reason, the Secretary is authorized to make loans for the purchase of supplies and equipment which support and supplement projects of the emergency employment program (sec. 205(a)).

Loans under this program will bear the interest and carry other terms and conditions as the Secretary may subscribe (sec. 205(b)). He may approve no-interest loans to municipalities and other local sponsors if necessary to get the program going.

12. Eligible Participants

Participants in programs under this act must reside in the areas served and must be unemployed or low-income persons. Low income is to be defined the same way as in section 125 of title I, part B of the Economic Opportunity Act, which in turn is tied to a definition developed in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. The intent is to achieve reasonable uniformity of eligibility for related Federal programs (sec. 206).

13. Special Conditions

The bill contains special conditions and limitations which experience with related programs has shown to be necessary (sec. 207). Projects may not involve political parties or so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship. No program may result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service, nor may a program result in the substitution of Federal funds for other funds for work that would otherwise be performed. Wages must be the highest of (a) the Federal minimum wage, (b) the most comparable State or local minimum wage, or (c) the prevailing wage rate in the area for similar work. Programs must contribute to occupational development or upward mobility of participants, to the extent feasible. Where a program involves physical improvements, preference must be given to those which are used by

low-income persons. The Secretary is required to have regulations related to internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, and evaluation procedures of agencies and organizations receiving financial assistance. Programs should seek to eliminate artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, and particular attention should be given to altering civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

14. Reports

The committee wants to be certain that the emergency employment program is working effectively. Therefore, the bill requires the Secretary to report to Congress twice a year (sec. 208).

15. Authorizations

The bill authorizes \$1 billion for job creation for the 1968 fiscal year and \$1.5 billion for 1969. A loan fund of \$300 million is established for 1968. All these sums shall remain available until expended (sec. 209).

The committee estimates that each job will average \$4,000 in annual wages and that another \$1,000 will be required for fringe benefits, supervision, administration, supplies, materials, and equipment. Thus, \$1 billion will allow for the creation of 200,000 jobs. At this stage it is not possible to predict the turnover rate, but if a participant holds such a job an average of 8 months before moving to a job in regular competitive employment, 300,000 persons could be served in a year for each \$1 billion.

XV. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

TITLE I OF THE BILL—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Section 1. Short Title

This section of the bill provides that the act be cited as the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

Section 2. Authorization of Appropriations

This section of the bill authorizes appropriations of the following amounts for the fiscal year 1968 and such sums as may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1969:

Title I:	
Pt. A—Job Corps.....	\$295, 000, 000
Pt. B—Work and training programs.....	567, 000, 000
Pt. D—Special impact programs.....	105, 000, 000
Title II: Community action programs.....	1, 062, 000, 000
Title III:	
Pt. A—Rural loans.....	20, 000, 000
Pt. B—Migrant workers.....	30, 000, 000
Title IV: Small business assistance.....	25, 000, 000
Title V:	
Pt. A—Work experience.....	70, 000, 000
Pt. B—Day care.....	35, 000, 000
Title VI: Administration.....	16, 000, 000
Title VIII: VISTA.....	33, 000, 000
Total.....	2, 258, 000, 000

Section 101. Job Corps Amendments

This section of the bill amends part A of title I of the act as follows:

Section 101. Restates the purposes of the Job Corps providing that the program is for low-income, disadvantaged youth, to assist youth who can need and benefit from an intensive program operated in a group setting to enable youth to become more responsible, employable and productive citizens in a way that contributes to the development of National, State, and community resources and to the development of techniques for working with the disadvantaged.

Section 102. Establishes the Job Corps in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Section 103. This section specifies eligibility requirements for the Job Corps and states that enrollees must be permanent residents of the United States, low-income individuals or members of low-income families requiring additional education, training or related assistance in order to hold employment, participate successfully in regular school work or qualify for other training programs. An enrollee must be currently living in an environment characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife or other disorienting conditions such as to substantially impair his prospects for successful participation in any other training or education program. Enrollees must also have the present capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure the full benefit of the Job Corps and be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that they could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern of work and training involved in the Job Corps. An enrollee must meet such other standards for enrollment as the Director may prescribe.

Section 104(a). Provides for the screening of applicants through arrangements with public and private agencies including community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. Requires that rules prescribed for screening and selection encourage recruitment through agencies having long-term contact with youth and include provisions for consultation with individuals and organizations such as courts, probation and parole officers, law enforcement authorities, schools, medical agencies, and advisers. Also requires that screening procedures include an interview with each applicant and careful and systematic inquiry concerning each applicant's background.

Section 104(b). Prohibits payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the referral of names of candidates for the Job Corps.

Section 104(c). Requires that Job Corps enrollment include an appropriate number of candidates selected from rural areas taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who reside in rural areas.

Section 105(a). Prohibits the selection of Job Corps applicants unless the applicant can participate successfully in group activities, is not likely to engage in activities that would prevent others from benefiting from the program or disrupt discipline or the center's relationships with surrounding communities, and manifests basic understanding of the rule and consequence of their violation. Also, requires that the Director obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows an applicant's individual situation that there is a reasonable opportunity that the Job Corps will help the applicant overcome his problem where he has a history of serious

and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other major behavioral aberrations.

Section 105(b). Permits the enrollment of applicants on probation or parole where the applicant's release from the supervision of probation or parole officials is mutually satisfactory to those officials and to the Director and will not violate applicable laws or regulations.

Section 106(a). Limits Job Corps enrollment to 2 years except as the Director may authorize in special cases.

Section 106(b). Provides that Job Corps enrollment shall not relieve any individual of his military obligations.

Section 106(c). Provides a form of oath or affirmation for each enrollee.

Section 106(d). Provides that each enrollee be assigned to a center closest to his residence taking into account current vacancies and requirements for efficient program operation.

Section 107(a). Describes the different kinds of Job Corps centers including conservation centers to be located primarily in rural areas and provides, in addition to other training and assistance, programs focused on the conservation of natural resources and development of community projects; men's training centers, to be located in urban or rural areas and provide programs which include training for youth who can be expected to engage successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semiskilled employment; and women's training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas and provide training and other activities appropriate to the special needs and potentialities of young women.

Section 107(b). Requires that men's and women's training centers, to the extent feasible, offer education and vocational training opportunities with supportive services on a nonresidential basis to enrollees in programs described in part B of title I.

Section 108(a). Requires that Job Corps center programs provide each enrollee education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation, and development and counseling. Enrollees are to participate in center work activities so as to increase their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

Section 108(b). Permits enrollee education and vocational training through local institutions which can provide training at comparable costs and equivalent in quality.

Section 108(c). Permits enrollees to obtain a high school equivalency certificate with the concurrency of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Section 108(d). Requires the director to assure that Job Corps activities do not displace presently employed workers or impair existing contracts.

Section 109(a). Permits the director to provide enrollees with personal travel and leave allowances, quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, and other expenses as necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances may be paid to enrollees at a rate not to exceed \$35 per month during the first 6 months of their participation in the program and not to exceed \$65 per month thereafter. Allowances in excess of \$35 per month but not exceeding \$65 may, however, be provided from the beginning of an enrollee's participation if he is expected to com-

plete training in less than 6 months. Allowances must be graduated up to the maximum so as to encourage continued participation in the program and may be reduced in appropriate cases as a disciplinary measure.

Section 109(b). Requires the director to prescribe rules governing enrollees' leave and prohibits the director, except in cases of emergency, from assuming transportation costs connected with an enrollee's leave where the enrollee has not completed at least 6 months' service in the Job Corps.

Section 109(c). Provides each enrollee with a readjustment allowance not to exceed \$50 for each month of Job Corps participation. An enrollee, however, is not entitled to that portion of the readjustment allowance which is not paid to his dependents under section 109(d) unless he has remained in the program for 6 months, except where an enrollee has remained in the program for 3 months and is expected to complete his training in less than 6 months. The Director is permitted to advance an enrollee's readjustment allowance to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by the enrollee.

Section 109(d). Permits up to \$25 per month of the readjustment allowance to be paid during an enrollee's service directly to his spouse, child, or other dependent relative.

Section 110(a). Requires that standards of conduct and deportment be provided and strictly enforced in Job Corps centers. Requires dismissal from the Corps or transfer to another location where an enrollee's retention in the Corps or in the particular center will jeopardize the enforcement of standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

Section 110(b). Requires that individual Job Corps center directors be given full authority to take disciplinary measures against enrollees including dismissal from the Corps subject to appeal procedures to higher authority.

Section 111. Requires the director to encourage and cooperate in activities to establish mutually beneficial relationships between Job Corps centers and surrounding or nearby communities.

Section 112(a). Requires that the director provide testing and counseling of each enrollee at regular intervals.

Section 112(b). Requires the testing and counseling of each enrollee prior to termination and that the director seek to place him in a job in which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed or to assist him in obtaining further training or education. Also requires the director to utilize the U.S. Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

Section 112(c). Requires the Secretary of Labor to determine the status and progress of terminees and to assure that their needs for further education, training and counseling are met.

Section 112(d). Requires that an enrollee's pertinent records including counseling and testing data be made available to the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Section 112(e). Provides for the payment of an enrollee's readjustment allowance at the public employment service office nearest to his home or to the community in which he intends to reside after termination of training. The public employment service office is to maintain records on former enrollees including information as to the number of former enrollees who have declined help in finding a job,

the number successfully placed in jobs without further education and training, the number found to require further training before being placed in jobs, the types of training programs in which they participated, and the number of enrollees found to require further remedial or basic education in order to qualify for training programs together with information as to the types of programs for which former enrollees are found unqualified for enrollment. The director may use the services of other public or private organizations to make payment of the readjustment allowance and maintain similar records as those required to be maintained by the public employment service offices. In the case of enrollees placed in jobs prior to termination the director must maintain records on placement and follow-up.

Section 113(a). Requires careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program directly or through independent contracts, including consultation with other agencies to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps and other programs. The evaluation must seek to determine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of residential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use of combination residential and nonresidential components, from the use of centers with large as opposed to small enrollments and from the use of different types of program sponsors. The evaluation must include comparisons with control groups composed of persons not participating in the Job Corps. Job Corps participants' opinions of the strengths and weaknesses of the program must also be obtained and information must be obtained from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their Job Corps training. Evaluation results must be published in the Director's annual report.

Section 113(b). Provides for experimental or research projects including combined residential, nonresidential projects and for pilot projects to develop ways of better using facilities and of encouraging more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life to permit shorter enrollment in the Job Corps, of lowering transportation costs and of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness. The Director is also permitted to conduct pilot projects involving youth having a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other behavioral aberrations. Actions taken under this section, including progress made in connection with combined residential and non-residential projects must be reported to the Congress annually.

Section 113(c). Requires the Director to enter into agreements with State educational agencies establishing and operating model community vocational education schools and skill centers to be centrally located in urban areas having high dropout rates, large numbers of unemployed youths and a need for such school and center. The project must include a job survey of the area, a training program reflecting the needs of the job market as projected by the survey and the establishment of a community advisory committee. Arrangements must also be worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during school and after school hours.

Section 114(a). Facilitates State participation in the Job Corps program including consultation with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to the enforcement of State laws, standards of

enrollee conduct and discipline and the development of work experience and other activities for enrollees.

Section 114(b). Authorizes agreements with States to assist in the operation of State-operated programs to carry out the purpose of the Job Corps.

Section 114(c). Requires the submission of a plan setting forth the proposed establishment of a Job Corps center to the Governor of the State in which the center is to be located and gives the Governor a veto over such plan.

Section 115(a). Provides, with certain specified exceptions, that Job Corps enrollees are not to be considered Federal employees or subject to laws relating to Federal employment including those regarding hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits. The three enumerated exceptions relate to services performed by enrollees for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code and Social Security Act, compensation for work injuries, and tort claims against the United States.

Section 115(b). Permits adjustment and settlement of claims for damage to persons or property resulting from Job Corps operations in amount not exceeding \$500 when such a claim is a proper charge against the United States and not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code.

Section 115(c). Provides that personnel of the uniform services assigned to duty for support of the Job Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services.

Section 116(a). Limits Job Corps enrollment during fiscal year 1968 to 45,000 enrollees.

Section 116(b). Requires that on or before June 30, 1968 at least 25 percent of the Job Corps enrollees and residents receiving training be women.

Section 116(c). Limits the direct operating cost of Job Corps centers in operation for more than 9 months to a maximum of \$7,300 per enrollee.

Section 116(d). Provides that all studies, evaluations, proposals and data relating to Job Corps centers shall become the property of the United States.

Section 117(a). Prohibits inquiries concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee and requires that all disclosures concerning such matters be ignored, except as to membership in political parties or organizations which constitute by law a disqualification for Government employment. Prohibits discrimination by any Government employee against or in favor of any enrollee or applicant because of his political affiliations or beliefs.

Section 117(b). Prohibits officers, employees and enrollees of the Job Corps from taking any active part in political management or campaigns except as provided by or pursuant to statute. Prohibits such persons from using their official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or effecting the result thereof, although all such persons retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express in their private capacities opinions on all political subjects and candidates.

Section 117(c). Provides for notice and opportunity for explanation to an officer, employee or an enrollee who violates the foregoing pro-

visions and for certification of the facts to the Director with specific instructions by the Civil Service Commission as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective action to be taken.

Section 102. Work and Training Programs

Section 102 of the bill amends part B of title I, Work and Training for Youth and Adults.

Section 120. States the purpose of part B to provide useful work and training opportunities with related services and assistance to assist low-income youths to continue or resume their education and to help unemployed or low-income youths and adults to obtain and hold regular competitive employment with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems. Emphasizes a comprehensive approach, including programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in rural and urban areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

Section 121(a). Requires the director to designate community program areas for the planning and conduct of comprehensive community work and training programs.

Section 121(b). Defines a community to be a city, county, multicounty, or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation or a neighborhood or other area which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a comprehensive work and training program. Also requires the director to consult with other Federal agency heads regarding related programs to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes.

Section 121(c). States that a comprehensive work and training program must seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of services to enable them to obtain and hold employment, and provide a systematic approach to planning and implementation including the linkage of relevant components with one another and with other public and private programs.

Section 122(a). Provides for the designation of a prime sponsor which may be a public or private nonprofit agency to receive comprehensive work and training program funds. The prime sponsor must be capable of planning, administering, coordinating and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

Section 122(b). The prime sponsor is to be the community action agency unless an alternative prime sponsor is likely to have greater capability in planning and implementing a comprehensive work and training program.

Section 122(c). The prime sponsor must provide for participation of employers and labor organizations in the planning and conduct of programs.

Section 122(d). Encourages the prime sponsor to use public and private agencies to carry out comprehensive work and training program components including delegate agencies governed with the participation of the poor, educational institutions, the public employment service, health, welfare, training and other organizations.

Section 122(e). Requires that the prime sponsor and delegate agencies provide for resident participation in the planning, conduct

and evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program and its components. Residents must also be provided maximum employment opportunity in the conduct of component programs.

Section 122(f). Requires the director to assure administrative, accounting, personnel and evaluation standards and procedures.

Section 123(a). Authorizes financial assistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work and training programs or components of such programs for the following eligible activities:

(1) Programs providing part-time employment, on-the-job training and useful work experience for low-income students in the 9th through 12th grades and who need earnings to permit them to resume or maintain their attendance in school (in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps).

(2) Programs to provide unemployed, underemployed or low-income persons age 16 and over with useful work and training to assist them to develop their maximum occupational potential and to retain regular competitive employment (expanded N.Y.C.).

(3) Programs to provide work activities for the chronically unemployed poor with poor employment prospects who are unable because of age, lack of employment opportunity or otherwise to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs. Such programs must enable participants to participate in projects involving community betterment or beautification including activities contributing to the management, conservation or development of natural resources, recreational areas, parks, highways, and other lands (Nelson amendment).

(4) Programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities including new types of careers in activities improving the physical, social, economic or cultural condition of the community served in such fields as health, education, welfare, redevelopment and public safety (Scheuer amendment).

(5) Programs concentrating work and training resources in urban and rural areas, which are focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged and which are supported by specific commitments of cooperation from private and public employers (concentrated employment program).

(6) Supportive and follow-up services including health services, counseling, day care, transportation assistance and other necessary assistance.

(7) Employment centers and mobile employment service units to provide recruitment, counseling and placement services conveniently located in areas served.

(8) Programs to provide incentives to private employers to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers when an employee might not be fully productive, payment of on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of employer-recruiter costs in areas served and payments for the provision of transportation to and from work. In making reimbursements to employers the Director must assure that wages paid employees are not less than the Federal minimum wage.

(9) Means of planning, administering, coordinating and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

Section 123(b). Requires that by July 1, 1968, all work and training programs be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and that financial assistance for such components be provided to the prime sponsor unless the director grants an extension of time or exercises his authority under section 123(c). Also requires that the work and training components of the work experience program (title V of the act), to the maximum extent feasible, be linked to the comprehensive work and training program.

Section 123(c). Permits the director to provide financial assistance to organizations other than a prime sponsor to carry out component programs when, after considering the views of the prime sponsor, if any, the director determines that such assistance would enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve purposes of title I.

Section 124(a). Prohibits financial assistance for programs unless the following specified special conditions are met:

(1) No participants will be employed on projects involving political parties or activities related to sectarian instruction or religious worship.

(2) The program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services.

(3) Rates of pay for time spent in work training and education and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in light of the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant.

(4) The program will to the maximum extent feasible contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

Section 124(b). For programs providing work and training related to physical improvements, preference must be given to improvements used by low-income persons or families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in areas served.

Section 124(c). Programs must to the maximum feasible extent contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

Section 124(d). Projects must provide for the maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

Section 125(a). Requires that program participants be unemployed or low-income persons and provides that the Director in consultation with the Social Security Administrator shall establish criteria for low income taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences and other relevant factors. A person is deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

Section 125(b). Requires that participants be permanent residents of the United States.

Section 125(c). Participants are not to be deemed Federal employees or subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment.

Section 126. Provides that programs under part B be designed to deal with the incidence of long-term unemployment among the elderly and requires that the Director encourage the employment of such

persons as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

Section 127(a). Authorizes the conduct of pilot projects to develop new approaches to further the objectives of part B. Such projects may be conducted by public agencies or private organizations.

Section 127(b). Requires that the Director undertake pilot projects designed to encourage the maximum participation of private employers in work and training programs.

Section 127(c). Requires that the Director solicit and consider comments on pilot projects from the prime sponsor before approval of the project.

Section 128. Authorizes the provision of technical assistance for the initiation or effective operation of programs and the making of arrangements for the training of instructors and other personnel needed to carry out programs under parts B and D of title I. In carrying out this section the Director must give special consideration to the problems of rural areas.

Section 129. Authorizes financial assistance to State agencies for the provision of technical assistance and training with emphasis upon such services to rural areas, to assist in coordinating State activities relating to part B, to operate work and training programs in communities where a prime sponsor is not yet established, and to provide work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies.

Section 130. Requires that of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for programs authorized under title I that the Director reserve not to exceed 20 percent for the purpose of carrying out section 123(a)(5) (the concentrated employment program). Not more than 12½ percent of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year may be used within any one State. Remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out section 123 may be distributed under criteria established by the Director which are designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. Developing such criteria, the Director must consider such factors as population ratios, unemployment, and family income levels.

Section 131. Limits Federal financial assistance to programs under part B to 90 percent of the cost of such programs, giving the Director discretion to exceed such percentage where he determines it necessary in furtherance of the purposes of part B. Non-Federal contributions may be cash or in kind. If a community's non-Federal contribution under title I exceeds its 10-percent matching requirement, the excess may be used to meet its matching requirements under title II, authorizing community action programs.

Section 132(a). Requires the Director to develop and implement a program data system with other similar Federal data systems.

Section 132(b). Requires that the Director provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under part B including program effectiveness, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services. The Director must arrange for the obtaining of the opinions of program participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the program. The evaluation shall include comparisons with control groups composed of persons who have not participated in comprehensive work and training programs and shall seek to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of such programs and

related programs under other acts. The Director may contract for independent evaluations and the results of evaluations must be included in the Director's annual report.

Section 132(c). Requires that the Director develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness and that such standards be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by part B.

Section 103. Special Impact Programs

Section 103 of the bill amends part B of title I of the act.

Section 150. Provides that the purpose of part B is to establish special programs directed to the solution of critical problems existing in particular communities or neighborhoods within urban areas having especially large concentrations of low-income persons and rural areas having substantial outmigration to eligible urban areas and which are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions.

Section 151. Authorizes financial assistance to public or private agencies for programs which must be restricted in number so that each is of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact on the areas served. Programs may include economic and business development programs including those which provide financial and other incentives to business to locate in or near the areas served so as to provide employment opportunities for residents of such areas, community development activities which create new training and employment activities and contribute to an improved living environment, and manpower training programs which support and complement economic business and community development programs, including activities described in part B of title I.

Section 152(a). Requires that before providing financial assistance the Director determines that projects and facilities to the maximum feasible extent be located in the area served; that projects will promote the development of entrepreneurial and management skills and the ownership or participation in ownership of assisted businesses by residents of the area served; that projects be planned and carried out with the maximum participation of local businessmen by their inclusion on programs, boards of directors, advisory councils, or other means; that the program be coordinated with local planning under this act, the Model Cities Act, and other relevant plans for physical and human resources; that the requirements of subsections 122(f) and 124(a) of the act are met; and that preference be given to the residents of the areas served in filling jobs and training opportunities.

Section 152(b). Prohibits the extension of financial assistance to assist in the relocation of establishments from one location to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

Section 152(c). Provides that the level of financial assistance to areas served by the special impact program for related purposes under this act not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by part B.

Section 152(d). Requires that the Director reserve not less than 8 percent of the funds appropriated or allocated for title I for the purpose of carrying out part B.

Section 153(a). Requires that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development take steps under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to assure the availability of land for business location and expansion.

Section 153 (b). Provides that assisted areas be deemed redevelopment areas within the meaning of section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and that such areas qualify for assistance under the provisions of title II of that act.

Section 153(c). Requires the Director to take steps to assure that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of part D.

Section 154. Requires a thorough evaluation of program effectiveness to be conducted by such public or private organizations as the Director may designate and permits the payment of up to 100 percent of the costs of such evaluation.

Section 155. Provides that Federal grants for programs not exceed 90 percent of the cost unless the Director determines that grants in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of part B. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind. Where capital investment is required under contract with a private profit-making organization the Federal share of such capital investment shall not exceed 90 percent of the cost.

Section 104. Community Acting Program Amendments

Section 104 of the bill amends title II of the act—"Urban and Rural Community Action Programs."

Section 201. Restates the purpose of title II to assist communities in opening opportunities which enable low-income persons to achieve self-sufficiency.

Section 202(a). Requires that communities be encouraged and aided to plan and conduct community action programs which shall be designed to:

- (1) Provide services and assistance including innovative approaches to enable low-income persons to achieve economic independence, improve their living conditions, and increase their participation in community activities.

- (2) Stimulate agencies and institutions which provide services to low-income persons to expand, modify, and improve their programs.

- (3) Mobilize, utilize, and coordinate relevant public and private resources.

Section 202(b). Requires the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served in the planning, conduct, administration, and evaluation of all community action program components. Also requires that there be maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility.

Section 210. Requires that the Director encourage the formation of community action agencies which may be either public or private nonprofit agencies. The community action agency shall be responsible for and must be capable of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating a community action program. It shall serve as the prime sponsor for financial assistance under title II and must have adequate authority to administer funds, transfer and delegate funds to other agencies, and contract with public or private organizations.

Section 211. Defines a community as a city, county, multicounty or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation or a neighborhood or other area which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a community action program. Also requires that the Director consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for related programs to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes.

Section 212. Provides that a statewide or regional agency may be a community action agency in rural areas or smaller communities until a satisfactory community action agency is established. Such statewide or regional agencies must operate in accordance with sections 201, 202, and 213.

Section 213(a). Provides that a community action agency shall be governed by a board which is broadly representative of the community and which is organized to provide for the membership of both the public and private sectors.

Section 213(b). Requires that at least one-third of the membership of the governing board be persons selected by residents of the areas and members of the groups served. Also requires that each community action agency establish procedures to give appropriate representation to poor persons living in poverty-concentrated neighborhoods and other poor persons including the elderly and rural residents living outside such neighborhoods. All members of the governing board selected to represent specific geographic areas must reside in such areas.

Section 213(c). Requires community action agencies to establish procedures whereby community agencies and representative groups of the poor may petition the board for adequate representation.

Section 214(a). Empowers the community action agency governing board to establish adequate personnel policies and fiscal controls, approve overall plans, adopt and enforce program policies, and approve proposals for financial assistance, and provide for periodic evaluation of the program and its components.

Section 214(b). Requires that each community action agency provide for reasonable public access to books, records, and other information and for opportunity for public hearings at the request of local groups.

Section 215(a). Encourages community action agencies to make use of delegate agencies to carry out program components. Such agencies shall consist of neighborhood-based organizations which shall be encouraged to have at least one-half of the governing board composed of residents of the area or members of the groups served or other delegate agencies which must establish procedures so that such persons are enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests. Delegate agencies may be public or private organizations and each such agency must be capable of conducting programs, have adequate personnel policies and fiscal controls and provide reasonable public access to books, records, and other information.

Section 215(b). Encourages the establishment of housing development and services organizations as delegate agencies to focus on housing needs or low-income families and individuals. Such organizations may be nonprofit housing development corporations and may become sponsors of housing under existing programs of specialized

housing agencies but may not insure mortgages or duplicate the long-term capital financing functions of programs now administered by specialized housing agencies.

Section 220(a). Authorizes the provision of financial assistance to community action agencies for community action programs and components. Components may involve national emphasis program activities under section 221 and other activities including those which are designed to assist participants to secure and retain meaningful employment, attain an adequate education, make better use of available income, provide and maintain adequate housing, undertake family planning, obtain services for the prevention of narcotics addiction, alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and alcoholics, obtain emergency assistance through loans or grants to meet immediate and urgent individual and family needs, remove obstacles and solve personnel and family problems which block the achievement of self-sufficiency, achieve greater participation in the affairs of the community, and make more frequent and effective use of other programs related to the purposes of this title. The director may also provide financial assistance to other public or private non-profit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency.

Section 220(b). Requires that after July 1, 1968, each community action agency adopt a systematic approach to the achievement of the purposes of title II and to utilization of funds. Such systematic approach must encompass a planning and implementation process seeking to identify the problems and causes of poverty, seeking to mobilize and coordinate public and private resources, establishing program priorities, linking program components with one another and with other relevant programs, and providing for evaluation. The director may extend the time for this requirement to take into account the length of time the program has been in operation.

Section 220(c). Encourage(s) the Director to provide financial assistance to agencies other than community action agencies to carry out program components when, after considering the views of the community action agency, such assistance would enhance program participation or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the purposes of title II.

Section 220(d). Requires that 50 percent of the funds authorized and appropriated for title II be used to finance component programs under sections 220 and 221 (authorizing national emphasis programs) which are locally selected to respond to particular community needs.

Section 220(e). Prohibits the Director from establishing binding national priorities on funds authorized by this section but requires the director to review each application for financial assistance on its merits. Requires that the director, before extending financial assistance, determine the extent and nature of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to carry out effective programs.

Section 221(a). Permits the reservation of funds and authorizes financial assistance for national emphasis programs. Such financial assistance must be provided through the community action agency except as otherwise provided with respect to the Upward-Bound program and the carrying out of the director's independent funding authority under section 220(c), unless the community action agency chooses not to undertake that responsibility, fails to demonstrate

affirmatively its capability to undertake that responsibility, or does not exist in the area served. Community action agencies are encouraged to make maximum use of delegate agencies to operate national emphasis programs.

Section 221(b). This section describes the following seven national emphasis programs:

(1) **Headstart**—focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance and which will provide comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social and other services together with appropriate activities to encourage parent participation and permit the effective use of parent services.

(2) **Follow-Through**—focused upon children in kindergarten or elementary school previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive services and parent participation activities as in the Headstart program.

(3) **A legal services program**—providing legal advice, representation, counseling education and other legal services. Such projects must be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with legal professional standards. Principal local bar associations in the area must be consulted and their comments and recommendations considered before projects are approved or funded.

(4) **A comprehensive health services program**—focused upon urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of poverty as a marked inadequacy of health services for the poor. Such projects shall be designed to make possible the provision of comprehensive health services, to assure that such services are made readily accessible to low-income area residents and furnished in a manner responsive to their needs and with their participation. Funds for financial assistance for the comprehensive health services program shall be allotted according to need and may be used to pay the full costs of projects. Before funding projects the comments and recommendations of local medical associations and health agencies must be considered. Comprehensive health programs may also include projects designed to develop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health services for the poor. Such projects must encourage health professionals to direct their talents and energies toward providing health services for the poor.

(5) **Upward Bound**—designed to generate the skills and motivation necessary for education beyond high school. Financial assistance for Upward Bound projects may be provided directly to higher education institutions but must be closely coordinated with community action agency activities.

(6) **Project Find**—designed to identify and meet the needs of the elderly poor over the age of 60 in areas such as referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal and consumer assistance, recreation and other services, stimulation of additional services, provision of employment and volunteer opportunities, increased participation in community activities and programs, the development of all-season recreation centers and other activities.

(7) **A family planning program**—to provide assistance and services to low-income persons in the field of voluntary family

planning including the provision of information, medical assistance and supplies. The Director and the Secretary of HEW are required to coordinate and exchange information concerning family planning projects under their respective jurisdictions.

Section 221(c). Authorizes training research and technical assistance in connection with national emphasis programs.

Section 222. Requires that residents of the areas and members of the groups served be provided maximum employment opportunity in the conduct of all component community action programs. Also encourages the Director to employ persons 55 years and older as regular, part time, and short-term staff in component programs.

Section 223. Encourages the development of neighborhood centers designed to promote the effectiveness of needed services in such fields as health, education, manpower, child and economic development, housing, legal, recreation, and social services. Such centers must be organized to promote maximum participation of neighborhood residents in planning, policymaking, administration, and operation and they must be responsive to neighborhood needs and fully adapted to neighborhood conditions.

Section 224(a). Permits the allotment of not more than 2 percent of the sums appropriated or allocated for financial assistance under title II to Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands. Also permits the Director to reserve not to exceed 20 percent of such sums for allotment in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Director. The remaining sums will be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative number of public assistance recipients the average number of unemployed persons and the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. Unneeded allotments may be reallocated by the Director.

Section 224(b). Authorizes the separate allotment of funds for national emphasis programs except Headstart in accordance with the criteria prescribed in section 224(a) or in accordance with other criteria determined by the Director which will assure an equitable distribution of funds, provided that no more than 12½ percent of the funds for any one program is used in any one State.

Section 224(c). Limits Federal financial assistance in community action agencies to 90 percent of the approved cost of assisted programs with limited authority in the Director to exceed such percentage. Non-Federal contributions may be cash or in kind and excess community matching may be used to meet the local matching requirement under section 131.

Section 224(d). Prohibits the approval of program assistance unless the Director is satisfied that services provided will be in addition to and not in substitution for services previously provided without Federal assistance; that in-school educational services previously provided will be expanded and adapted through the use of the agency already providing such services where the needs of the poor and the purposes of assistance to be extended under the title will be more effectively met; and that other resources devoted to programs to meet the needs of the poor will not be diminished to provide State matching.

Section 230. Authorizes the provision of technical assistance to communities in planning, conducting, administering and evaluating programs, and for the training of personnel needed to achieve the purposes of the title.

Section 231(a). Authorizes financial assistance to State agencies to enable them to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies, to assist in coordinating State activities related to the title, to assist the Director in developing programs, promoting the participation of States and State agencies, and to assist the Director and the Economic Opportunity Council in identifying problems that operate to impede State level coordination of programs.

Section 231(b). Preference is given to programs and activities administered by State agencies assisted under section 231(a).

Section 231(c). Authorizes agreements with States and State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of the United States in providing financial assistance to community action agencies in connection with specific projects involving the common or joint use of State funds and title II funds.

Section 231(d). Requires submission of all plans for assistance to the Governor of the State in which such assistance will be provided and prohibits the approval of funding of programs if disapproved by the Governor within 30 days of such submission unless such disapproval is overridden by the Director. This provision does not apply to assistance to any institution of higher education.

Section 232(a). Authorizes financial assistance for pilot projects conducted by public agencies or private organizations designed to assist in the development of new approaches to aid in furthering the purposes of title II. Also authorizes financial assistance for research.

Section 232(b). Requires that the views of the local community action agency be solicited and considered before approval of any pilot projects in its community.

Section 232(c). Requires the development and carrying out of pilot projects to aid the elderly, focus on the problems of rural poverty, and develop new techniques and efforts to prevent narcotics addiction or rehabilitate narcotics addicts, and to encourage the participation of private for profit organizations.

Section 232(e). Requires that the Director establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot projects and the use of all research under title II. The plan must set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities among such objectives and the Director must consult with other Federal agencies to minimize duplication among similar activities or projects. A description of the plan, activities subject to the plan, and findings derived from those activities together with a statement indicating the time and manner which the benefits of those activities are expected to be realized must be included as part of the Director's annual report.

Section 232(f). Limits the funding of pilot and research programs to not more than 10 percent of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for title II.

Section 233(a). Requires the continuing evaluation of community action programs including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanism for the delivery of services. Such evaluations must include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not partici-

pated in community action programs. The Director may contract for independent evaluations and must arrange for the obtaining of participants' opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. Evaluation results must be included in the Director's annual report.

Section 233(b). The Director must develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness which must be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance.

Section 240(a). Requires the establishment of criteria to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance between urban and rural areas and that in establishing such equitable distribution the Director consider the relative number of low-income families, unemployed persons, persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis, school dropouts, adults with less than an eight-grade education, persons rejected from military service, and the number of persons living in urban as opposed to rural places.

Section 240(b). Requires that special efforts be made to increase the efforts of rural community action programs and that such efforts be described in the Director's annual report.

Section 241. Requires the prescription of regulations to assure fiscal responsibility, adequate internal controls, accounting requirements, and rules governing personnel standards.

Section 242(a). Requires the making of a preliminary audit survey reviewing and evaluating accounting systems and internal management controls within 3 months after the effective date of the first contract of assistance to an organization or an agency.

Section 242(b). Requires annual audits of each grant or contract followed by a determination of whether expenditures incurred must be disallowed, and authorizes the recovery of sums disallowed.

Section 243. Enumerates the following six special limitations:

(1) Authorizes a reasonable allowance for attendance at community action agency governing board meetings or neighborhood council or committee meetings to encourage maximum participation of members of groups and residents of the areas served. Also authorizes the reimbursement of expenses connected with such meetings.

(2) Prohibits officers or employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity from serving as board, council, or community action agency committee members, or on the boards of delegate agencies.

(3) Requires that the Director assure that family planning services are available to all low-income individuals meeting eligibility criteria established by the community action agency and requires that in connection with any such financial assistance no individual will be provided information, medical supervision, or supplies inconsistent with his moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs, and that no individual will be provided with such services unless they are voluntarily requested.

(4) Prohibits financial assistance under title II to provide general or curricular aid to education in any school or school system other than for special health, welfare, remedial, and other noncurricular services.

(5) Requires that special consideration be given to programs making maximum use of existing schools, community centers,

settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

(6) Requires that the Director make maximum use of the services of the Commissioner of Education, and State and local education agencies in extending assistance for supplemental educational services.

Section 244. Authorizes the carrying out of programs under title II through fiscal year 1970.

Section 105(a). Amendments to Title III—Rural Areas Programs

Section 105(a) of the bill changes the heading of part A to read "Part A—Rural Loan Program" and inserts a new heading, "Loans to Families," before section 302.

Section 105(b)

Section 105(b) of the bill amends section 301 of the act to restate the purpose of the rural loan programs to be to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards.

Section 105(c)

Section 105(c) of the bill amends section 302(a) of the act to insert the word "principal" after the word "aggregate".

Section 105(d)

Section 105(d) of the bill transfers section 606 of the act to title III as section 306.

Section 105(e). Amendments to Title III, Part B, Migrant Program

Section 105(e) of the bill amends and restates the migrant program, part B of title III.

Section 311. States the purpose of part B to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life.

Section 312(a). Authorizes financial assistance to State and local agencies and nonprofit institutions and cooperatives to carry out migrant assistance programs.

Section 312(b). Authorizes such programs to include projects or activities in the fields of day-care for children, education, health, improved housing and sanitation, including the provision and maintenance of emergency and temporary housing, legal advice and representation, consumer training and counseling, the promotion of increased community acceptance of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families, and equipping of unskilled migrant workers through education and training to meet the changing demands in agricultural employment brought about by technological advancement.

Section 313(a). Requires maintenance of effort as a condition of financial assistance.

Section 313(b). Requires coordination with other programs or activities providing assistance to migrants and other persons served under part B.

Section 314(a). Authorizes the Director to provide technical assistance or training of personnel as required to implement migrant assistance programs.

Section 314(b). Requires the Director to evaluate migrant workers projects and publish the results of such evaluations in his annual report.

Section 106. Amendment to Part D of Title III—Indemnity Payments to Dairy Farmers

Section 106 of the bill extends the *present* authority contained in section 331(c) of the act for indemnity payments to dairy farmers through the end of fiscal year 1968.

Section 107. (a) Amendments to Title IV—Employment and Investment Incentives

Section 107(a) of the bill amends section 401 of the act by striking out “enterprises” and inserting “enterprises with special attention to small business concerns (1) located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or (2) owned by low-income individuals.”

Section 107(b)

Section 107(b) of the bill amends section 402(a) of the act in several respects to assure that in connection with loan assistance, emphasis is placed upon the preservation or establishment of small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of poverty, and that management training programs are of sufficient scope and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency.

Section 107(c)

Section 107(c) of the bill deletes the first subsection 402(b) of the act which is replaced by a new section 406 of the act.

Section 107(d)

Section 107(d) of the bill rennumbers section 405 of the act to read “407” and includes the Secretary of Commerce as authorized to carry out programs through fiscal year 1970. This section of the bill also strikes out section 404 and inserts new sections 404, 405, and 406 of the act which provide as follows:

Section 404. Requires that the Administrator of the Small Business Administration assure that in any fiscal year at least 50 percent of the loans granted small business concerns are located in urban areas having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to such concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Director and the SBA are to jointly define the meaning of “low income” as it applies to owners of small business concerns. Such definition need not correspond with the definition of “low income” as used elsewhere in the act.

Section 405. Prohibits financial assistance which would be used in relocating business establishments from one area to another where such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

Section 406(a). Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to public or private agencies for projects to provide technical and management assistance to individuals and enterprises eligible for assistance with special attention to small businesses located in urban areas of high poverty concentration and small businesses owned by low-income individuals.

Section 406(b). Authorizes financial assistance for projects including planning, research, feasibility studies and market research, identification and development of new business opportunities, and stimulation of new private capital resources, the furnishing of centralized services, the establishment and strengthening of business services agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives, encouragement of placement contracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in high poverty concentration urban areas, and the furnishing of business counseling, management training, legal and other related services with special emphasis upon management training programs using the resources of the business community, including the development of management training opportunities in existing businesses.

Section 406(c). Requires that the Secretary of Commerce give preference to projects promoting the ownership, participation in ownership, or management of small business concerns by residents of urban areas with high concentrations of poverty and low-income individuals, and to projects planned and carried out with a participation of local businessmen.

Section 406(d). Requires that, to the extent feasible, services be provided in a location easily accessible to the individuals and small businesses served.

Section 406(e). Requires that the Secretary of Commerce take steps to assure that contracts, subcontracts and deposits are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of title IV.

Section 406(f). Requires that the Secretary of Commerce provide continuing program evaluation and that the results of such evaluation be published in the annual report of the Director.

Section 108(a). Day Care Projects

Section 108(a) of the bill adds a new part B to title V of the act authorizing financial assistance for day care projects as follows:

Section 521. States the purpose of the part to be to provide day care for children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons in order to enable the parents or relatives of such children to undertake or continue vocational training, basic education or gainful employment.

Section 522(a). Authorizes grants to public and private agencies to pay not in excess of 90 percent of the cost of day care projects which shall provide health, education, social and other supportive services as may be needed. Projects costs may include the costs of renovation and alteration of physical facilities and financial assistance may be provided in conjunction with or to supplement day care projects under the Social Security Act or other relevant statutes.

Section 522(b). Authorizes the Director to require families which are not low-income families to make payments in whole or in part for day care services where the family's financial condition is, or becomes through employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment appropriate.

Section 522(c). Requires that preference be given to projects providing day care for children whose parents or relatives desire to accept employment or undertake vocational training or basic education.

Section 522(d). Requires that the Director and the Secretary of HEW coordinate day care programs under their respective jurisdictions with a view toward establishing common program standards

and regulations and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels. Preference would be given to applicants which show evidence of coordination and cooperation between their projects and other day care programs in the areas served.

Section 522(e). Requires the thorough evaluation of each project with a view toward determining the extent to which day care may have increased the employment of parents and relatives of the children served, may have reduced the cost of aid and services to such children, the extent to which such children have received health and educational benefits, and the extent to which the project has been coordinated with other day care activities. The Director may pay up to 100 percent of the costs of such evaluations and a report on the program must be included in the Director's annual report.

Section 523(a). Requires that Director, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of HEW take necessary steps to train unemployed or low-income individuals in day care projects in the operation of vocational training, work experience, and basic education programs under their jurisdiction.

Section 523(b). Requires that preference be given to projects in which unemployed or low-income individuals are to be employed including individuals who are receiving or eligible to receive assistance under the Social Security Act.

Section 524. Authorizes the carrying out of programs under this part through fiscal year 1970.

Section 108(b)

Changes the heading of title V of the act to read "Work Experience, Training, and Day Care Programs."

Section 108(c)

Amends title V to insert a new heading, "Part A—Work Experience and Training Programs" preceding part A of title V.

Section 108(d)

Technical amendment changing title references to part references in relevant section of part A title V.

Section 109(a). Amendments to Title VI—Administration and Coordination

Section 109(a) of the bill amends section 601(a) of the act to provide authority for five Assistant Directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity, authorizing a new Assistant Director to oversee rural programs.

Section 109(b)

Section 109(b) of the bill amends section 604 of the act to require that the Director prescribe procedures relating to appeals, notice, and hearing where a delegate agency's application to the prime sponsor or community action program under title I-B or II has been rejected or not acted upon, where financial assistance is suspended under titles I-B, II, and III-B for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions except in emergency situations, and where financial assistance is denied under section 123, 220, 221, or 312.

Section 109(c)

Section 109(c) of the bill amends section 609 of the act relating to the definitions of various terms used in the act, including the terms "State," "financial assistance," and "permanent resident of the United States."

Section 109(d)

Section 109(d) of the bill amends section 610 of the act relating to programs for the elderly poor to state the intention of Congress that the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under the act. Section 610 authorizes the Director to investigate and study in order to develop plans for the participation of elderly poor in economic opportunity programs, including programs for providing employment opportunities, public service opportunities, education, and other services and activities. The Director is also required to maintain a review of all programs to assure that the needs of the elderly poor are given adequate consideration, to initiate and maintain interagency liaison respecting the elderly, and to determine and recommend to the President and Congress additional programs for the elderly poor. The Director is required to describe the implementation of section 610 in his annual report.

Section 109(e)

Section 109(e) of the bill rennumbers and amends, technically, section 610-1 of the act.

Section 109(f)

Section 109(f) of the bill provides a new section 612 of the act which authorizes joint Federal agency funding of programs whereby any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced to a community action or other agency assisted under the act. In such cases the local matching requirement would be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each agency.

Section 109(g)

Section 109(g) of the bill amends section 616 of the act relating to the transfer of funds to provide authority and the Director to transfer not to exceed 10 percent of the amount appropriated or allocated through any program or activity to other programs or activities under the act provided that no such transfer will increase the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity by more than 10 percent.

Section 109(h)

Section 109(h) of the bill amends the act by inserting a new part B to title VI relating to coordination and providing as follows:

Section 630. States the purpose of part B of title VI to be to establish an Economic Opportunity Council, provide for an information center, promote better coordination among all programs related to the act, and to improve cooperation and communication among all levels of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related to the purposes of the act.

Section 631(a). Establishes the Economic Opportunity Council in the Executive Office of the President. The Council is to be composed of the Director of OEO and the heads of such Federal departments

and agencies and such presidential assistants and other Federal officials as the President may from time to time designate. The President would designate one Council member to serve as Chairman and each member may designate an alternate to sit in his stead in the event of his unavoidable absence.

Section 631(b). Defines the responsibilities of the Council as providing for the coordination of programs and activities related to the act, developing basic policies and setting priorities with respect to such programs and activities, resolving differences among Federal departments and agencies, and initiating and arranging for the carrying out of specific actions and projects designed to achieve the objectives of the act.

Section 631(c). Requires that the President appoint an Executive Secretary of the Council who in turn would appoint and fix the compensation of personnel to assist him in performance of his duties. Also authorizes employees of other Federal departments and agencies to be detailed to the Council from time to time to provide temporary assistance.

Section 631(d). The Council's activities would, to the extent appropriate, be described in the Director's annual report to the Congress.

Section 631(e). Requires the reservation of sums authorized to carry out title VI in order to carry out the purposes of section 631.

Section 632. Defines the coordination responsibilities of the Director as including special studies of specific coordination problems, the continuing evaluation of all activities under the act with a view toward identifying coordination problems, and the preparation of a 5-year national poverty action plan showing estimates of Federal and other governmental expenditures needed to eliminate poverty in the Nation within alternative periods of time. Such a plan would include estimates of the funds necessary to finance relevant programs authorized by this and other acts and any new programs which may be necessary to eliminate poverty. The plan would be presented to the Congress and updated on an annual basis.

Section 633(a). Requires that other Federal agencies cooperate with the Director and carry out their programs so as to assist him in carrying out the programs and provisions of the act.

Section 633(b). Authorizes the Economic Opportunity Council and the Director to call upon other Federal agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and other materials.

Section 633(c). Authorizes the President to direct that programs and functions, including the expenditure of funds of Federal agencies, be carried out in conjunction with or in support of programs authorized under the act.

Section 634. States Federal agencies' responsibilities in terms of encouraging appropriate combinations among related projects and activities and charges the Economic Opportunity Council with responsibility for carrying on a continuing review of the operation of this section including identifying programs which may be especially appropriate for closely coordinated operation at the State or local level and evaluating and making recommendations concerning implementing procedures of various Federal agencies.

Section 635. Sets forth provisions of the current law covering the information center, with one amendment, to specifically authorize the Director, in connection with the operation of the center, to study

ways of improving existing information systems, the adequacy of data, ways in which data generated at the State or local level may be incorporated into Federal systems, and methods by which data may be made more readily available to State and local officials, agencies and organizations and used to further coordination objectives.

Section 636. Restates, with no change, a provision in the current law that prohibits use of funds to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

Section 637. Restates a provision in current law setting forth certain responsibilities of the Director, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and other Federal agency heads with respect to the coordination of training programs. One technical modification deletes the specific reference to the President's Committee on Manpower, which was created by Executive order rather than by statute, in favor of a more general reference to "mechanisms prescribed by the President."

Section 638. Defines the terms "programs related to this Act" and "coordination" as used in part B. The definition of coordination is designed to focus upon four types of actions—actions to improve the common effectiveness of programs in reaching and serving the poor; actions to promote better use of Federal assistance under diverse programs at the State or local level; actions to promote simplification and efficiencies through the joint or combined use of Federal resources; and actions to improve communication and general cooperation. Examples are given under each of these categories, in order to emphasize the importance of specific, practical problems and the necessity for approaching coordination on a basis that allows for State and local participation.

Section 110(a). Amendment to Title VII

Section 110(a) of the bill revises title VII relating to treatment of income for certain public assistance purposes to provide that all trainees will receive their full training allowance or wages under the act known as qualifying income as long as their combined income does not exceed their poverty line. When the combined income exceeds the poverty line, the public assistance payment would be reduced at a rate which would permit the termination of assistance when the total family income is 25 percent above the poverty line.

Mathematically, the amendment is expressed as follows:

$$\frac{\text{PA (public assistance)} - .25 \text{ PL (poverty line)}}{\text{PA}} = \text{rate of reduction}$$

For the family of five with a poverty line of \$3000 a month, 0.25 PL equals (0.25 times \$300) or \$75. For varying amounts of public assistance, the rate of reduction for this family would be as follows:

<i>Rate of reduction (percent)</i>	
Public assistance:	
\$100 per month.....	25
\$150 per month.....	50
\$200 per month.....	62.5
\$250 per month.....	66½ (70)

In the last instance, the maximum rate of 66% described in the bill would apply, since the committee believes that any higher rate would serve as a disincentive, and under this arrangement, there would be no time limitation but instead public assistance payments would be terminated only when income has risen sufficiently.

Section 111. Volunteer Programs

Section 111 of the bill amends title VIII authorizing the VISTA program and other domestic volunteer service programs as follows:

Section 801. Revises the existing statement of purpose to reflect the addition of the new part-time volunteer program.

Section 810. Authorizes establishment of full-time volunteer programs, continuing, substantially unchanged, the provisions of the present law authorizing establishment of the VISTA program, including those relating to the terms and conditions of volunteer service, special restrictions on political activities, and the requirement that volunteers be assigned to duties in a State and that programs be operated therein only with the approval of the Governor of such State. The provisions concerning the assignment of volunteers to programs at the State or local level have been deleted, their implementation having proved to be infeasible. However, to the extent such provisions embodied the concept of encouraging participation of part-time volunteers in activities in their home communities, this concept has been reaffirmed in section 820 of the amendments.

Section 811. Incorporates in the act provisions to prescribe the commitment to be required of full-time volunteers. It provides that these persons must obligate themselves to serve full time in combating poverty, to the extent practicable, living among and at the economic level of the people served. It also provides that, except when on authorized leave, they must remain on call for service at all times without regard to regular working hours.

This section also states that regular volunteers serve for periods of 1 year. However, it establishes as a permanent volunteer program, the short-term programs which have been conducted as special programs under section 805 of the existing law. These programs allow persons to serve as VISTA associates on a less-than-1-year (but at least 2-month) basis.

This section also continues the existing law's requirement that volunteers subscribe to an oath or affirmation to support and uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Section 812(a). Provides for volunteer stipends at a rate not to exceed \$50 per month, or, in the case of volunteer leaders, \$75 per month. Further specifically requires that volunteer leaders be selected from those volunteers who have developed and shown special skills during a year of volunteer service.

Section 812(b). Makes several clarifying changes in the act. It would provide that, except in extraordinary circumstances, accrued stipends are not to be paid to a volunteer until completion of service. Moreover, it makes clear that in the event of the death of a volunteer during service, accrued stipend, as with accrued Job Corps readjustment allowances, is to be paid to designated beneficiaries or survivors in accordance with provisions of law governing payment of money due to deceased Federal employees (5 U.S.C. 5583).

Section 812(c). Allows the Director to provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers

to encourage them to utilize their VISTA experience in combating poverty after their formal connection with the program has ended.

Section 820. Authorizes the Director to encourage, develop and assist new programs designed to increase and expand volunteer participation. These programs will utilize volunteers working part time, or for periods of less than 2 months duration, in or near their home communities, in activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. They will be designed to encourage persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under the Economic Opportunity Act; in programs to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional or technical skills to contribute these skills to the betterment of neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations of poor; and in programs which assist existing national and local agencies and organizations to obtain services of volunteers more readily. It also authorizes the Director to provide specialized training for volunteers participating in such programs. Volunteers under this section would not receive any stipend, nor, except in unusual or special circumstances affecting their project, could they receive any other support or allowances. The section also provides that the value of the services of volunteers under this section, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution towards the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, may be accepted toward provision of the non-Federal share.

Section 821. Retains existing authority for special demonstration projects, except for the existing VISTA associates short-term projects which would be incorporated into the regular VISTA program described under section 811. In view of this latter change, the limit on the portion of the title VIII funds which can be utilized for this section has been reduced from 15 to 10 percent. Also, administrative provisions have been transferred to section 832(b) of the proposed part C.

Section 822(a). Authorizes the Director to conduct or provide financial assistance for demonstration projects in not more than four areas during the fiscal year 1968 and not more than six areas during each of the 2 fiscal years under which VISTA volunteers and members of the Teachers Corps provide youthful criminal offenders aged 16 to 25 with intensive education, training and counseling for at least a 6-month period prior to their release from confinement and for at least a 6-month period thereafter. Not more than 100 VISTA volunteers may be employed pursuant to this section during fiscal year 1968 and not more than 150 during each of the 2 succeeding fiscal years. The Commissioner of Education would furnish on a reimbursable basis members of the Teachers Corps not more than 40 Teachers Corps members would be used during fiscal year 1968 and not more than 60 such members during the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

Section 822(b). Members of the Teachers Corps participating in the program who are not experienced teachers would be compensated at the rate of \$75 per week plus \$15 per week for each dependent.

Section 831. Requires coordination of volunteer programs under this title with community action programs, and with other appropriate Federal, State, local and national programs. It would require the Director to consult with other Federal, State, local and national agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this act in order to encourage greater and more effective use of volunteer

services in those programs. It would also require that the regular or full-time and part-time programs be carried out in a coordinated manner and that steps be taken accordingly to encourage former full-time volunteers to participate in part-time programs and to encourage part-time volunteers to enter full-time programs.

Section 832. Would require the Director to take necessary steps, including the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest feasible participation of older persons in VISTA programs and activities, and encourages the development of a variety of volunteer services to the elderly.

Section 833. Retains provisions of existing law relating to the application of Federal law.

Section 834. Requires that all support be provided at lowest possible cost; that volunteers not be used to displace employed workers, and that no agency utilizing volunteers may be compensated for services performed by those volunteers.

Section 835. Authorizes the carrying out of the programs under title VIII through fiscal year 1968.

Section 112. Amendment to the Manpower Development and Training Act

Section 112 of the bill amends section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide that the training allowance for all youths shall be at the same rate, eliminating the difference in existing law between the training allowance for youth coming out of other training programs and youth not attending such programs.

Section 113. Technical Amendments

Section 113 of the bill makes certain technical amendments, and amends section 105 of title III of the United States Code to make the Executive Secretary of the Economic Opportunity Council equivalent in grade to the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

TITLE II OF THE BILL—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967

Title II of the bill sets forth, in sections 201 through 209 of the bill, the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 the sections and subsections of which provide as follows:

Section 202. Congressional findings state that certain communities and areas of the country are burdened by severe unemployment and underemployment; that such areas contain large concentrations of persons unable to obtain jobs; that this situation is aggravated by the migration of unskilled persons from rural areas; and, that these areas are doubly handicapped because of a lack of jobs. At the same time there is a huge backlog of need for additional public services and facilities. The purpose is stated to be to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas.

Section 203. Areas eligible for assistance are those containing a high proportion of low-income families and individuals having severe problems of unemployment and underemployment.

Section 204(a). The Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide financial assistance to public and private agencies for the cost of programs to create employment opportunities. There must be maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility, participation of

and cooperation with local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and others. Assistance would be coordinated with MDTA, Economic Opportunity, EDA, and model cities programs.

Section 204(b). Jobs made available would include those in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such jobs would include those available immediately to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain employment, those providing placement resources for persons completing training under the Economic Opportunity Act and other manpower programs, and those which use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic labor surplus. Priority is given to projects which are labor intensive in character.

Section 204(c). The Secretary may provide financial assistance to assure that persons employed would be provided opportunity for further education, training, and necessary supportive services to prepare them to obtain regular competitive employment in the future. Maximum effort must be made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons.

Section 205. Loans for the purchase of supplies and equipment to support and supplement projects under section 204 would be authorized.

Section 206. Unemployed or low-income persons residing in eligible areas would be entitled to participate in programs.

Section 207. Financial assistance could not be extended until certain specified conditions are met, including those prohibiting political and religious involvement and displacement of employed workers. Rates of pay would be required to meet legal minimum wages. Programs relating to physical improvements used by low-income persons in eligible areas would be given preference.

Section 208. A report to the Congress is required twice a year.

Section 209. For the 1968 fiscal year, the sum of \$1 billion is authorized for job programs and \$300 million for loans, For the 1969 fiscal year, the authorization for the jobs program is \$1.5 billion.

XVI. CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED

AN ACT To mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. Although the economic well-being and prosperity of the United States have progressed to a level surpassing any achieved in world history, and although these benefits are widely shared throughout the Nation, poverty continues to be the lot of a substantial number of our people. The United States can achieve its full economic and social potential as a nation only if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society. It is therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. It is the purpose of this Act to strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in furtherance of that policy.

It is the sense of the Congress that it is highly desirable to employ the resources of the private sector of the economy of the United States in all such efforts to further the policy of this Act.

TITLE I—WORK TRAINING AND WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

[PART A—JOB CORPS

[STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

[SEC. 101. The purpose of this part is to prepare for the responsibilities of citizenship and to increase the employability of young men and young women aged sixteen through twenty-one by providing them in rural and urban residential centers with education, vocational training, useful work experience, including work directed toward the conservation of natural resources, and other appropriate activities.

[ESTABLISHMENT OF JOB CORPS

[SEC. 102. In order to carry out the purposes of this part, there is hereby established within the Office of Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the "Office"), established by title VI, a Job Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps").

[JOB CORPS PROGRAM]

[SEC. 103. The Director of the Office shall prescribe regulations to prevent programs under this part from displacing presently employed workers or the impairment of existing contracts for services. The Director of the Office (hereinafter referred to as the "Director") is authorized to—

[(a) enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local agency or private organization for the establishment and operation, in rural and urban areas, of conservation camps and training centers and for the provision of such facilities and services as in his judgment are needed to carry out the purposes of this part, including but not limited to agreements with agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources of the Nation and of developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas, whereby the enrollees of the Corps may be utilized by such agencies in carrying out, under the immediate supervision of such agencies, programs planned and designed by such agencies to fulfill such responsibility, and including agreements for a botanical survey program involving surveys and maps of existing vegetation and investigations of the plants, soils, and environments of natural and disturbed plant communities: *Provided*, That such agreements shall provide that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation camp or training center shall become the property of the United States;

[(b) arrange for the provision of education and vocational training of enrollees in the Corps: *Provided*, That, where practicable, such programs may be provided through local public educational agencies or by private vocational educational institutions or technical institutes where such institutions or institutes can provide substantially equivalent training at comparable costs: *Provided*, That such arrangements for education and training of enrollees in the Corps shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain education or training necessary to qualify them for the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;

[(c) provide or arrange for the provision of programs of useful work experience and other appropriate activities for enrollees;

[(d) establish standards of safety and health for enrollees, and furnish or arrange for the furnishing of health services; and

[(e) prescribe such rules and regulations and make such arrangements as he deems necessary to provide for the selection of enrollees and to govern their conduct after enrollment, including appropriate regulation as to the circumstances under which enrollment may be terminated: *Provided, however*, That the Director shall make no payments to any individual or to any organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Corps.

[COMPOSITION OF THE CORPS]

[SEC. 104.](a) The Corps shall be composed of young men and young women who are permanent residents of the United States, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age twenty-two at the

time of enrollment, and who meet the standards for enrollment prescribed by the Director. Participation in the Corps shall not relieve any enrollee of obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.). For purposes of this subsection, any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered a permanent resident of the United States.

[(b) In order to enroll as a member of the Corps, an individual must agree to comply with rules and regulations promulgated by the Director for the government of the Corps.

[(c) The total enrollment of any individual in the Corps shall not exceed two years except as the Director may determine in special cases.

[(d) Each enrollee (other than an enrollee who is a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 104(a) of this Act) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to the oath or affirmation required under this subsection.

[(e) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that, on or before July 1, 1967, the number of women in residence, and receiving training, at Job Corps conservation camps and training centers is not less than 23 per centum of the total number of enrollees in the Job Corps.

[(f) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, in such a manner as to increase the capacity of conservation camps and training centers of the Job Corps above the capacity of 45,000 enrollees in such camps and centers.

[(g) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job Corps camps and centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$7,500 per enrollee in such camps and centers.

[(h) Job Corps officials shall, whenever possible, stimulate formation of indigenous community activity in areas surrounding Job Corps camps and centers to provide a friendly and adequate reception of enrollees into community life.

[(i) Whenever there is a vacancy in a Job Corps camp or center in the region in which an enrollee resides which is an appropriate camp or center to meet the needs of the enrollee as determined by the Director, such enrollee shall be assigned to such camp or center. If no such vacancy exists, the enrollee shall be assigned to the Job Corps camp or center offering programs and activities appropriate to meet the needs of the enrollee as determined by the Director, which is nearest to the residence of such enrollee.

[(j) The Director shall to the maximum extent feasible assure that each enrollee who successfully completes enrollment in the Corps furnishes to him six months and eighteen months after such completed enrollment the following information:

[(1) The place of residence of such enrollee;

[(2) The employment status of such enrollee;

[(3) The compensation received by such enrollee in his current job and the compensation received by him in the job, if any, immediately preceding his current job; and

[(4) Such other relevant information determined by the Director to be necessary for an effective follow-up.

[ALLOWANCE AND MAINTENANCE

[SEC. 105. (a) Enrollees may be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and other expenses as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the Director may determine, for applicants for enrollment to or from places of enrollment, and for former enrollees from places of termination to their homes.

[(b) Upon termination of his or her enrollment in the Corps, each enrollee shall be entitled to receive a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation therein as determined by the Director: *Provided, however,* That under such circumstances as the Director may determine a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a member of his or her family (as defined in section 609(c)) and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director. In the event of the enrollee's death during the period of his or her service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 61f).

[APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

[SEC. 106. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this part, an enrollee shall be deemed not to be a Federal employee and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

[(b) Enrollees shall be deemed to be employees of the United States for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and of title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed for such purposes to be performed in the employ of the United States.

[(c) (1) Enrollees under this part shall, for the purposes of the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), be deemed to be civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 40 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 790) and the provisions thereof shall apply except as hereinafter provided.

[(2) For purposes of this subsection:

[(A) The term "performance of duty" in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent

from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Corps.

[(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-2 under the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.), and section 6(d)(1) of the former Act (5 U.S.C. 756 (d)(1)) shall apply to enrollees.

[(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin or accrue until the day following the date on which the enrollment of the injured enrollee is terminated.

[(d) An enrollee shall be deemed to be an employee of the Government for the purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code.

[(e) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

[POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

[SEC. 107. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

[(b) No officer, employee or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee, enrollee or Federal employee who solicits funds for political purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act.

[(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.

[STATE-OPERATED YOUTH CAMPS

[SEC. 108. The Director is authorized to enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to such regulations as he may adopt, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

[REQUIREMENT FOR STATE APPROVAL OF CONSERVATION CAMPS AND TRAINING CENTERS

[SEC. 109. In carrying out the provisions of part A of this title no conservation camp, training center or other similar facility designed to carry out the purposes of this Act, shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor of the State and such plan has not been disapproved by him within thirty days of such submission.

[YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

[SEC. 110. Within the Job Corps there is authorized a Youth Conservation Corps in which at any one time no less than 40 per centum of the male enrollees under this part shall be assigned to camps where their work activity is directed primarily toward conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources of the Nation, and developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas. Such work activity shall be performed under the direction of members of agencies charged with the responsibility of conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources and of developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas.

[STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

[SEC. 111. (a) Within Job Corps camps and centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps camp or center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

[(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in Job Corps conservation camps and training centers, the individual directors of Job Corps camps and centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulation set by the Director.

[(c) The Director shall establish appropriate procedures to insure that the transfer of Job Corps enrollees from State or local jurisdiction shall in no way violate parole or probationary procedures of the State. In the event procedures have been established under which the enrollment of a youth subject to parole or probationary jurisdiction is acceptable to appropriate State authorities, the Director shall make provisions for regular supervision of the enrollee and for reports to

such State authorities to conform with the appropriate parole and probationary requirements in such State.

[EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

[SEC. 111-1. The Director shall arrange, through grants or contracts, for the carrying out of experimental and demonstration projects (of which not to exceed four may involve the construction of new camps or centers) providing youth employment and training on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. Such projects may involve the use of resources or authority under both this part and part B of this title, pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Labor where funds under part B of this title are so used, and the Director is authorized to waive any provision of such parts which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of such projects essential to a determination and demonstration of their feasibility and usefulness. The Director shall report to the Congress a full description of actions taken and progress made under this section no later than March 1, 1968.]

PART A—JOB CORPS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth standards and procedures for selecting individuals as enrollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of residential centers in which enrollees will participate in intensive programs of education, vocational training, work experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps. Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting, to become more responsible, employable, and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of National, State, and community resources, and to the development and dissemination of techniques for working with the disadvantaged that can be widely utilized by public and private institutions and agencies.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office of Economic Opportunity a "Job Corps".

INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a young man or woman must be a person who—

- (1) is a permanent resident of the United States who has attained age sixteen but not attained age twenty-two at the time of enrollment;*
- (2) is a low-income individual or member of a low-income family who requires additional education, training, or intensive counseling and related assistance in order to secure or hold meaningful employment, participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify for*

other training programs suitable to his needs or satisfy Armed Forces requirements;

(3) is currently living in an environment so characterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair his prospects for successful participation in any other program providing needed training, education, or assistance;

(4) is determined, after careful screening as provided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure the full benefit of the program authorized in this part, and to be free of medical and behavioral problems so serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern of work and training which that programs involves; and

(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enrollment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these rules shall be implemented through arrangements which make use of appropriate agencies and organizations such as community action agencies, public employment offices, professional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall establish specific standards and procedures for conducting screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruitment through agencies and individuals having contact with youths over substantial periods of time and able, accordingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with other individuals and organizations, including courts, probation and parole offices, law enforcement authorities, schools, welfare agencies, and medical agencies, and advisers. They shall also provide for—

(1) the interviewing of each applicant for the purpose of—

(A) determining whether his educational and vocational needs can best be met through the Job Corps or any alternative program in his home community;

(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent data relating to his background, needs, and interests for evaluation in determining his eligibility and potential assignment; and

(C) giving the applicant a full understanding of the Job Corps program and making clear what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the event of his acceptance.

(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic inquiry concerning the applicant's background for the effective development and, as appropriate, clarification of information concerning his age, citizenship, school and draft status, health, employability, past behavior, family income, environment, and other matters related to a determination of his eligibility.

(b) The Director shall make no payments to any individual or organization solely as compensation for the service of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the Job Corps.

(c) The Director shall take all necessary steps to assure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an appropriate number of candidates

selected from rural areas, taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential facilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide geographic dispersion

SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

SEC. 105. (a) *No individual shall be selected as an enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable expectation that he can participate successfully in group situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to observe those rules. Before selecting an individual who has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction or other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows his individual situation that there is reasonable expectation that the opportunity provided by the Job Corps will help him to overcome his problem.*

(b) *An individual who otherwise qualifies for enrollment may be selected even though he is on probation or parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and all reports to State or other authorities that may be necessary to comply with applicable probation or parole requirements.*

ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

SEC. 106. (a) *No individual may be enrolled in the Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director may authorize in special cases.*

(b) *Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve any individual of obligations under the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).*

(c) *Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of Cuba described in section 609 (3) of this Act) must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to this oath or affirmation.*

(d) *Each enrollee shall be assigned to a center appropriate to his needs, as determined by the Director, which (taking into account current vacancies and requirements for the efficient program operation) is closest to the residence of such enrollee.*

JOB CORPS CENTERS

SEC. 107. (a) *The Director may make agreements with Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for the establishment*

and operation of Job Corps Centers. These centers shall be primarily residential in character and shall be designated and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training, work experience (either in direct program activities or through arrangements with employers), counseling and other services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall include conservation centers to be located primarily in rural areas and to provide, in addition to other training and assistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or public recreational areas or to assist in developing community projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas and to provide activities which shall include training and other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected to participate successfully in training for specific types of skilled or semi-skilled employment; and women's training centers, to be located in either urban or rural areas, and which shall provide education, training, and other activities appropriate to the special needs and potentialities of young women.

(b) To the extent feasible, men's and women's training centers shall offer education and vocational training opportunities, together with supportive services, on a nonresidential basis to enrollees in programs described in part B of this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimbursable basis or through such other arrangements as the Director may specify.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be operated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-organized and fully supervised program of education, vocational training, work experience, planned avocational and recreational activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required program for each enrollee shall include activities designed to assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with problems he may encounter in his home community or in adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-term upward mobility. Center programs shall include required participation in center maintenance support and related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and discipline.

(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may arrange for enrollee education and vocational training through local public or private educational agencies, vocational educational institutions, or technical institutes where these institutions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could provide through other means.

(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school; and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee's level of educational attainment.

(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do not displace presently em-

employed workers or impair existing contracts for service and will be coordinated with other work-experience programs in the community.

ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

SEC. 109. (a) The Director may provide enrollees with such personal travel and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, and other expenses as he may deem necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances shall be established at a rate not to exceed \$35 per month during the first six months of an enrollee's participation in the program and in not to exceed \$65 per month thereafter, except that allowances in excess of \$35 per month, but not exceeding \$65 per month, may be provided from the beginning of an enrollee's participation if it is expected to be of less than six months' duration, and the Director is authorized to pay personal allowances in excess of the rates specified herein in unusual circumstances as determined by him. Such allowances shall be graduated up to the maximum so as to encourage continued participation in the program, achievement and the best use by the enrollee of the funds so provided and shall be subject to reduction in appropriate cases as a disciplinary measure. To the degree reasonable, enrollees shall be required to meet or contribute to costs associated with their individual comfort and enjoyment from their personal allowances.

(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules governing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed at least six months service in the Job Corps.

(c) The Director shall provide each former enrollee, upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the Job Corps: Provided, however, That no enrollee shall be entitled to that portion of a readjustment allowance which is not paid pursuant to subsection (d) of this section unless he has remained in the program at least one hundred and eighty days, except that such portion shall be paid to an enrollee who has remained in the program at least ninety days and whose participation in the program is expected to be of less than six months' duration, and except in unusual circumstances as determined by the Director. The Director may, from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director deems necessary to meet extraordinary financial obligations incurred by that enrollee. In the event of an enrollee's death during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid readjustment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory service may be paid during the period of service of the enrollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the payment of an equal amount by the Director.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently enforced. In the case of

violations committed by enrollees, dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations shall be made in every instance where it is determined that retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center, will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other enrollees.

(b) In order to promote the proper moral and disciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including, but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as provided under regulation set by the Director.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall cooperate in activities designed to establish mutually beneficial relationships between Job Corps centers and surrounding or nearby communities.

COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT

SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.

(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabilities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In placing enrollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements to determine the status and progress of terminees and to assure that their needs for further education, training, and counseling may be met.

(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy of his pertinent records, including data derived from his counseling and testing, other than confidential information, shall be made available immediately to the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

(e) The Director shall, to the extent feasible in accordance with section 637(b) of this Act, arrange for the readjustment allowance provided for in section 109(c) of such Act, less any sums already paid pursuant to subsection (d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have not already found employment) at the public employment service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee, if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated an intent to reside. The Director shall seek to make arrangements by which public employment service officers will maintain records regarding former enrollees who are thus paid at such offices including information as to—

(1) the number of former enrollees who have declined the offices' help in finding a job;

(2) the number who were successfully placed in jobs without further education or training;

(3) the number who were found to require further training before being placed in jobs and the types of training programs in which they participated; and

(4) the number who were found to require further remedial or basic education in order to qualify for training programs, together with information as to the types of programs for which such former enrollees were found unqualified for enrollment.

If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of any other public or private organization or agency in lieu of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that organization or agency to make the payment of the readjustment allowance and maintain the same types of records regarding former enrollees as are herein specified for maintenance by public employment service offices. In the case of enrollees who are placed in jobs by the Director prior to the termination of their participation in the Job Corps, the Director shall maintain records providing pertinent placement and follow-up information.

EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS

SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the careful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program, directly or by contracting for independent evaluations, with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as practicable, and providing information needed to assess the effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to determine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of residential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use of facilities combining residential and nonresidential components, from the use of centers with large as opposed to small enrollments, and from the use of different types of program sponsors, including public agencies, universities, and private corporations. The evaluation shall also include comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in the program. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other Government and private agencies specific information concerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.

(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration projects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transportation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this

subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects and with the prime work and training sponsors, as described in part B of this title in the communities where the projects will be carried out. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, including programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the Congress concerning the actions taken under this section, including a full description of progress made in connection with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

(c) In order to determine whether upgraded vocational education schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how communities could make maximum utilization of expensive educational and training facilities, the Director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay the cost of establishing and operating model community vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it contains provisions designed to assure that—

- (1) a job survey be made of the area;
- (2) the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as projected by the survey;
- (3) an advisory committee composed of representatives of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;
- (4) arrangements have been worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours; and
- (5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will be provided.

PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

SEC. 114. (a) The Director shall take necessary action to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of enrollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaningful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and coordination with State-operated programs.

(b) The Director may enter into agreements with States to assist in the operation or administration of State-operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part. The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be established within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days of such submission.

APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

SEC. 115. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those regarding hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits:

(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed employees of the United States and any service performed by an individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in the employ of the United States.

(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be deemed civil employees of the United States within the meaning of the term "employee" as defined in section 8101 of title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that subchapter shall apply except as follows:

(A) The term "performance of duty" shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

(B) In computing compensation benefits for disability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be deemed that received under the entrance salary for a grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to accrue until the day following the date on which the injured enrollee is terminated.

(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered employees of the Government.

(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not exceeding \$500.

(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are detailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not be counted in computing strength under any law limiting the strength of such services or in computing the percentage authorized by law for any grade therein.

SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

SEC. 116. (a) The Director shall not use any funds made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, in a manner

that will increase above forty-five thousand the enrollee capacity of Job Corps centers.

(b) The Director shall take necessary action to assure that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of Job Corps enrollees in residence and receiving training, at least 25 per centum shall be women.

(c) The Director shall take necessary action to assure that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job Corps centers which have been in operation for more than nine months do not exceed \$7,300 per enrollee.

(d) The Director shall take necessary action to assure that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced or developed with Federal funds in the course of the operation of any conservation or training center shall become the property of the United States.

POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

SEC. 117. (a) No officer or employee of the executive branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes by law a disqualification for Government employment. No discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by any person in the executive branch of the Federal Government against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically authorized or required by law.

(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall take any active part in political management or in political campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee, enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation of the Corrupt Practices Act.

(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Commission finds that any person has violated the foregoing provisions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned, certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.

[PART B—WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS

[NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

[SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall formulate and carry out—

[(1) programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equivalent to that of students in such grades) who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school, and

[(2) programs to provide unemployed individuals useful work experience and on-the-job training, combined where needed with edu-

cational and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training designed to assist the individuals to develop their maximum occupational potential. Enrollment shall be limited to individuals aged sixteen through twenty-one years.

[(b) In determining for purposes of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) whether a student is from a low-income family, the Director shall consider a student to be from such a family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

[FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

[SEC. 113. (a) The Director is authorized to enter into agreements providing for the payment by him of part or all of the cost of a program submitted under section 112 if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

[(1) enrollees will be employed either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private organizations;

[(2) no enrollees will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

[(3) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services; and

[(4) the rates of pay for time spent in work, training or education and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.

[(b) In approving on-the-job training projects with other than public or private nonprofit organizations, the Director is authorized to enter into agreements to pay reasonable training costs but not wages paid to enrollees for services performed.

[(c) In approving projects under this part, the Director shall give priority to projects with high training potential and high potential for contributing to the upward mobility of the trainee.

[ENROLLEES IN PROGRAM

[SEC. 114. (a) Enrollment in programs under this part shall be limited to young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, and whose participation in such programs will be consistent with the purposes of this part. For purposes of this subsection, any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of section 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be considered a permanent resident of the United States.

[(b) Enrollees shall be deemed not to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

[(c) Where appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Director may provide for testing, counseling, job development, and

referral services to youths through public agencies or private organizations.

【LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

【SEC. 115. Federal assistance to any program pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

【EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

【SEC. 116. The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this part among the States. In developing such criteria, he shall consider among other relevant factors the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels. Not more than 12½ per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this part shall be used within any one State.】

PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful work and training opportunities, together with related services and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed or low-income persons, both young and adult, to obtain and hold regular competitive employment, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in developing programs which respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs using both public and private resources to overcome the complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 121. (a) The Director shall designate or recognize community program areas for the purpose of planning and conducting comprehensive community work and training programs.

(b) For the purpose of this title, a community may be a city, county, multicounty or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a comprehensive work and training program. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to community action, manpower services physical and economic development, housing, education, health, and other community services to encourage the establishment of coterminous or comple-

mentary boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and comprehensive work and training programs assisted under this title.

(c) A comprehensive work and training program must seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of services which will enable them to obtain and hold employment. It shall provide a systematic approach to planning and implementation including the linkage of relevant component programs authorized by this Act with one another and with other appropriate public and private programs and activities. It shall also provide for evaluation.

PRIME SPONSORS AND DELEGATE AGENCIES

SEC. 122. (a) For each community program area, the Director shall recognize a public or private nonprofit agency which shall serve as the prime sponsor to receive funds under section 123 (except as otherwise provided in section 123(c)). This agency must be capable of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

(b) The prime sponsor shall be the community action agency unless the Director determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that an alternative prime sponsor is likely to have greater capability in planning and implementing a comprehensive work and training program.

(c) The prime sponsor shall provide for participation of employers and labor organizations in the planning and conduct of the comprehensive work and training programs.

(d) The prime sponsor shall be encouraged to make use of public and private organizations as delegate agencies to carry out components of the comprehensive work and training program, including without limitation agencies governed with the participation of the poor and other residents of the neighborhoods or rural areas served, educational institutions, the public employment service, the public welfare agency, other health and welfare agencies, private training institutions, and other capable public and private organizations.

(e) The prime sponsor and delegate agencies shall provide for participation of residents of the area and members of the groups served in the planning conduct, and evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program and its components. Such persons shall be provided maximum employment opportunity in the conduct of component programs, including opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement.

(f) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 123. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work and training programs or components of such programs, including the following:

(1) programs to provide part-time employment, on-the-job training, and useful work experience for students from low-income families who are in the ninth through twelfth grades of school (or are of an

age equivalent to that of students in such grades) and who are in need of the earnings to permit them to resume or maintain attendance in school;

(2) programs to provide unemployed, underemployed, or low-income persons (aged sixteen and over) with useful work and training (which must include sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job training) designed to assist those persons to develop their maximum occupational potential and to obtain regular competitive employment;

(3) special programs which involve work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands;

(4) special programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement:

(5) special programs which concentrate work and training resources in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed persons, which are appropriately focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which are supported by specific commitments of cooperation from private and public employers;

(6) supportive and follow-up services to supplement work and training programs under this or other Acts including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in work and training programs and in employment;

(7) employment centers and mobile employment service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and placement services, conveniently located in urban neighborhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the most disadvantaged;

(8) programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment of on-the-job counseling and other sup-

portive services, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation: Provided, That in making such reimbursements to employers the Director shall assure that the wages paid any employee shall not be less than the minimum wage which would be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the employee and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof; and

(9) means of planning, administering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training program.

(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training component programs conducted in a community under this section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work and training program and financial assistance for such components shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the Director determines there is a good cause for providing an extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsection (c). After that date, the work and training components of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training program, including funding through the prime sponsor where appropriate.

(c) The Director may provide financial assistance to a public agency or private organization other than a prime sponsor to carry out one or more component programs described in subsection (a) when he determines, after soliciting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if any, that such assistance would enhance program effectiveness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the purpose of this title.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

SEC. 124. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant;

(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will

contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director, in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States.

(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

ELDERLY

SEC. 126. The Director shall provide that programs under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular, part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

PILOT PROJECTS

SEC. 127. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects which are designed to develop new approaches to further the objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by public agencies or private organizations.

(b) The Director shall undertake pilot projects designed to encourage the maximum participation of private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and training programs under this part.

(c) Before the Director may approve a pilot project, he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the project will be undertaken.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly or through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) technical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective operation of programs under this part. He may also make arrangements for the training of instructors and other personnel needed to carry out work and training programs under this part and part D of this title. He shall give special consideration to the problems of rural areas.

ROLE OF THE STATES

SEC. 129. The Director may provide financial assistance to appropriate State agencies to—

(1) provide technical assistance and training, as authorized by section 128, with particular emphasis upon service to rural areas and for this purpose preference shall be given to the State agency which administers programs assisted by section 231;

(2) assist in coordinating State activities related to this part;

(3) operate work and training programs in communities which have not yet established an acceptable prime sponsor; and

(4) provide work and training opportunities on State projects and in State agencies: Provided, That these opportunities shall be made available to participants in community work and training programs.

EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 130. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the purpose of carrying out section 123 (a) (5); but not more than 12½ per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the provisions of section 123, the Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels.

LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 131. Federal financial assistance to any program or activity carried out pursuant to section 123 of this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program or activity, including costs of administration. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percentage if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 224(c).

PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

SEC. 132. (a) The Director shall provide for the development and implementation of a program data system consistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal programs. Such data shall be published periodically.

(b) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of the programs under this part, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the delivery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include comparisons with proper control

groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of work and training programs authorized by this Act and by other Acts, including the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract for independent evaluations of such programs or individual projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included in the report required by section 608.

(c) The Director shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 123, 128, and 129.

PART C—WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. [121.] 141. The purpose of this part is to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students, particularly students from low-income families, in institutions of higher education who are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

SEC. [122.] 142. (a) From the sums appropriated to carry out this title for a fiscal year, the Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this part referred to as the "Commissioner") shall reserve the amount needed for making grants under section 123. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted by the Commissioner among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. The remainder of the sums so reserved shall be allotted among the States as provided in subsection (b).

(b) Of the sums being allotted under this subsection—

(1) one-third shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of persons enrolled on a full-time basis in institutions of higher education in all the States.

(2) one-third shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of high school graduates (as defined in section 103(d)(3) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963) of such State bears to the total number of such high school graduates of all the States, and

(3) one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 in such State bears to the number of related children under eighteen years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000 in all the States.

(c) The amount of any State's allotment which has not been granted to an institution of higher education under section 123 at the end of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be reallocated by the Commissioner, in such manner as he determines will best assist in achieving the purposes of this Act. Amounts reallocated under this subsection shall be available for making grants under section 123 until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which appropriated.

(d) For purposes of this section, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

GRANTS FOR WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS

SEC. **[123]** 143 (a) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with institutions of higher education under which the Commissioner will make grants to such institutions to assist in the operation of work-study programs as hereinafter provided.

(b) For the purposes of this part—

(1) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which (A) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate (B) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (C) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, (D) is a public or other nonprofit institution, and (E) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association approved by the Commissioner for this purpose or, if not so accredited, (i) is an institution with respect to which the Commissioner has determined that there is satisfactory assurance, considering the resources available to the institution, the period of time, if any, during which it has operated, the effort it is making to meet accreditation standards, and the purpose for which this determination is being made, that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time, or (ii) is an institution whose credits are accepted on transfer by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited. Such term also includes any public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing and any school which provides not less than a one-year program of training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation and which meets the provisions of clauses (A), (B), (D), and (E). If the Commissioner determines that a particular category of such schools does not meet the requirements of clause (E) because there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit schools in such category, he shall, pending the establishment of such an accrediting agency or association, appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by schools in such category, which shall (1) prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify schools in such category to participate in the program pursuant to this part, and (II) determine whether particular

schools not meeting the requirements of clause (E) meet those standards. For purposes of this subsection, the Commissioner shall publish list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered.

(2) The term "collegiate school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

(3) The term "associate degree school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

(4) The term "accredited" when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner.

CONDITIONS OF AGREEMENTS

SEC. [124.] 144. An agreement entered into pursuant to section 123 shall—

(a) provide for the operation by the institution of a program for the part-time employment of its students in work for the institution itself or work in the public interest for a public or private nonprofit organization under an arrangement between the institution and such organization, and such work—

(1) will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services.

(2) will be governed by such conditions of employment as will be appropriate and reasonable in light of such factors as type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee, and

(3) does not involve the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or is to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

(b) provide that funds granted an institution of higher education, pursuant to section 123 may be used only to make payments to students participating in work-study programs, except that an institution may use a portion of the sums granted to it to meet administrative expenses, but the amount so used may not exceed 5 per centum of the payments made by the Commissioner to such institution for that part of the work-study program in which students are working for public or nonprofit organizations other than the institution itself;

(c) provide that in the selection of students for employment under such work-study program preference shall be given to students from low-income families and that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (1) is in need of the earnings from such employment in order to pursue a course of study at such institution, (2) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing such course of study while employed under the program covered by the agreement, and (3) has been ac-

cepted for enrollment as a full-time student at the institution or, in the case of a student already enrolled in and attending the institution, is in good standing and in full-time attendance there either as an undergraduate, graduate, or professional student;

(d) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session;

(e) provide that in each fiscal year during which the agreement remains in effect, the institution shall expend (from sources other than payments under this part) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this part) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for such employment during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which the agreement is entered into;

(f) provide that the Federal share of the compensation of students employed in the work-study program in accordance with the agreement will not exceed 90 per centum of such compensation for work performed during the period ending three years after the date of enactment of this Act and 75 per centum thereafter;

(g) include provisions designed to make employment under such work-study program, or equivalent employment offered or arranged for by the institution, reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all eligible students in the institution in need thereof; and

(h) include such other provisions as the Commissioner shall deem necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this part.

SOURCES OF MATCHING FUNDS

SEC. [125.] 145. Nothing in this part shall be construed as restricting the source (other than this part) from which the institution may pay its share of the compensation of a student employed under a work-study program covered by an agreement under this part, and such share may be paid to such student in the form of services and equipment (including tuition, room, board, and books) furnished by such institution.

EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. [126.] 146. The Commissioner shall establish criteria designed to achieve such distribution of assistance under this part among institutions of higher education within a State as will most effectively carry out the purposes of this Act.

[PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

[ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS

[SEC. 131 (a) The purpose of this part is to establish special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of the critical problems existing in particular communities and neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas of the Nation having, in the judgment of the Director, especially large concentrations of low-income persons; (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency,

chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions; and (3) where feasible and appropriate, are part of a citywide plan for the reorganization of local or State agencies in order to coordinate effectively all relevant programs of social development.

[(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to make grants to public or private nonprofit organizations, or to enter into contracts with other private organizations, for the payment of all or part of the cost of programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e) of this Act. The Director shall assure that the work training and employment opportunities created under these special programs are filled by the residents of the communities or neighborhoods served and that the activities pursued are carried out in the communities and neighborhoods described in subsection (a). For the purposes of this section, the Director may include youths aged sixteen to twenty-one who are unemployed, underemployed, or below the poverty level as established for the programs described in sections 205 (d) and (e).

[(c) The Director shall establish such criteria, and impose such conditions, as may be necessary or appropriate to assure that no program assistance under this part will result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services and to assure that the rates of pay and other conditions of employment will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work performed, geographical region, and proficiency of the employee.

[(d) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall establish such procedures or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to assure maximum coordination with community action programs approved pursuant to part A of title II of this Act.

[FEDERAL SHARE IF PROGRAM COSTS

[SEC. 132. Federal grants to any program carried out pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment is required under a contract with a private organization (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital investment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above.]

PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 150. *The purpose of this part is to establish special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of the critical problems existing in particular communities or neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas having especially large concentrations of low-income persons, and within those rural areas having substantial out-migration to eligible urban areas, and (2) are of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact in*

such communities and neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency, chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 151. The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies or private organizations for the payment of all or part of the costs of programs which are designed to carry out the purposes of this part. Such programs shall be restricted in number so that each is of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact on the area served. Such programs may include—

(1) economic and business development programs, including programs which provide financial and other incentives to business to locate in or near the areas served so as to provide employment opportunities for residents of those areas, and programs such as those described in title IV of this Act for small businesses in or owned by residents of such areas;

(2) community development activities which create new training and employment opportunities and which contribute to an improved living environment; and

(3) manpower training programs for unemployed or low-income persons which support and complement economic, business, and community development programs, including without limitation activities such as those described in part B of this title.

REQUIREMENTS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 152. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program or component project under this part unless he determines that—

(1) all projects and related facilities will, to the maximum feasible extent, be located in the area served;

(2) projects will, where feasible, promote the development of entrepreneurial and management skills and the ownership or participation in ownership of assisted businesses by residents of the area served;

(3) projects will be planned and carried out with the maximum participation of local businessmen by their inclusion on program boards of directors, advisory councils, or through other appropriate means;

(4) the program will be appropriately coordinated with local planning under this Act, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and with other relevant plans for physical and human resources of the areas served;

(5) the requirements of subsections 122(f) and 124(a) of this Act have been met; and

(6) preference will be given to the residents of the areas served in filling jobs and training opportunities.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall not be extended to assist in the relocation of establishments from one location to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

(c) The level of financial assistance for related purposes under this Act to the area served by a special impact program shall not be diminished in order to substitute funds authorized by this part.

(d) Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not less than 8 per centum for the purpose of carrying out this part.

APPLICATION OF OTHER FEDERAL RESOURCES

SEC. 153. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall, in consultation with the Director, take all necessary steps under the authority granted to him under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to assure that land for business location and expansion purposes is made available as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this part.

(b) Areas selected for assistance under this part shall be deemed "redevelopment areas" within the meaning of section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and shall qualify for assistance under the provisions of title II of that Act.

(c) The Director shall take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this part.

EVALUATION

SEC. 154. Each program for which payments are made under section 151 shall provide for a thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of the program in achieving the goals of this part. This evaluation shall be conducted by such public or private organizations as the Director may designate, and up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid from funds appropriated to carry out this part. The results of such evaluations or a summary of them, together with the Director's findings and recommendations concerning the program, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

FEDERAL SHARE OF PROGRAM COSTS

SEC. 155. Federal grants to any program carried out pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services: Provided, That where capital investment is required under a contract with a private organization (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital investment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above.

PART E—DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. [141] 161. The Director shall carry out the programs for which he is responsible under this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

【TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

【PART A—GENERAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

【STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

【SEC. 201. The purpose of this part is to provide stimulation and incentive for urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty through community action programs.

【COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

【SEC. 202. (a) The term “community action program” means a program—

【(1) which mobilizes and utilizes in an attack on poverty resources, public or private, of any urban or rural, or combined urban and rural, geographical area (referred to in this part as a “community”), including but not limited to a State, metropolitan area, county, city, town, multicounty unit, or multicounty unit or any neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which is sufficiently homogeneous in character to be an appropriate area for an attack on poverty under this part;

【(2) which provides services, assistance, and other activities of sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward elimination of poverty or a cause or causes of poverty through developing employment opportunities, improving human performance, motivation, and productivity, or bettering the conditions under which people live, learn, and work;

【(3) which is developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served;

【(4) which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a public or private nonprofit agency (other than a political party), or a combination thereof; and

【(5) which includes provision for reasonable access of the public to information including, but not limited to, reasonable opportunity for public hearings at the request of appropriate local community groups, and reasonable public access to books and records of the agency or agencies engaged in the development, conduct, and administration of the program, in accordance with procedures approved by the Director.

【(b) The Director is authorized to prescribe such additional criteria for programs carried on under this part as he shall deem appropriate. Such criteria shall include requirements to assure (1) that each agency responsible for a community action program is qualified to administer such program and the funds granted to it efficiently, effectively, and in a manner fully consistent with the provisions and purposes of this part, having due regard for the size and complexity of such program and the number of persons and size of the area served; (2) that each such agency is subject to evaluation of program progress and regular or periodic audits and that the results or findings of such evaluations and audits are considered by the agency as well as by the Director in connection with proposals or applications for the renewal, expansion, or modification of any such program; (3) that each such agency main-

tains records and internal controls needed to achieve and document compliance with all legal requirements and that all records bearing exclusively on grants made under this part are available to the General Accounting Office; (4) that each such program is carried on in accordance with standards and policies, including rules governing the conduct of officers and employees, to preclude the use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting, or resulting in an identification of such program with, any partisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office; and (5) that the personnel of each such agency are selected, employed, promoted, and compensated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, or personnel plans approved by him, as promoting efficiency and the effective use of funds.

[(c)(1) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after March 1, 1967, a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which contains representatives of various geographical areas in the community unless such representatives are required to live in the area they represent.

[(2) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after March 1, 1967, a community action program which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board on which representatives of the poor do not comprise at least one-third of the membership.

[(3) The representatives of the poor shall be selected by the residents in areas of concentration of poverty, with special emphasis on participation by the residents of the area who are poor.

[(4) In communities where substantial numbers of the poor reside outside of areas of concentration of poverty, provision shall be made for selection of representatives of such poor through a process, such as neighborhood meetings, in which the poor participate to the greatest possible degree.

[(d) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which representative groups of the poor including but not limited to minority groups, the elderly, and the rural population, which feel themselves inadequately represented on their community action agency policy board, may petition for adequate representation on such board.

[(ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

[SEC. 203. (a) From the sums appropriated to carry out this title for a fiscal year, the Director shall reserve the amount needed for carrying out sections 204 and 205. Not to exceed 2 per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted by the Director among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this part. Twenty per centum of the amount so reserved shall be allotted among the States as the Director shall determine. The remainder of the sums so reserved shall be allotted among the States as provided in subsection (b).

[(b) Of the sums being allotted under this subsection—

[(1) one-third shall be allotted by the Director among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of public

assistance recipients in such State (as determined on the basis of the latest appropriate data) bears to the total number of public assistance recipients in all the States (as so determined);

[(2) one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the annual average number of persons unemployed in such State (as determined on the basis of the latest appropriate data) bears to the annual average number of persons unemployed in all the States (as so determined); and

[(3) the remaining one-third shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-third as the number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in such State bears to the number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in all the States.

[(c) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Director determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out this part shall be available for reallocation from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Director may fix, to other States in proportion to their original allotments for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Director estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out this part; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallocated among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallocated to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

[(d) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

[FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

[SEC. 204. The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of development of community action programs.

[FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONDUCT AND ADMINISTRATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

[SEC. 205. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay part or all of the costs of community action programs which have been approved by him pursuant to this part, including the cost of carrying out programs which are components of a community action program and which are designed to achieve the purposes of this part. Such component programs shall be focused upon the needs of low-income individuals and families and shall provide expanded and improved services, assistance, and other activities, and facilities necessary in connection therewith. Such programs shall be conducted

in those fields which fall within the purposes of this part including, but not limited to, employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, welfare, and special remedial and other noncurricular educational assistance for the benefit of low-income individuals and families. The Director shall require that where an agency pays an employee engaged in carrying out a community action program at a rate in excess of \$15,000 per annum, payment of such excess shall not be made from Federal funds; and any amount paid such an employee in excess of \$15,000 per annum shall not be considered in determining whether section 208(a) has been complied with.

[(b) No grant or contract authorized under this part may provide for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system.

[(c) In determining whether to extend assistance under this section the Director shall consider among other relevant factors the incidence of poverty within the community and within the areas or groups to be affected by the specific program or programs, and the extent to which the applicant is in a position to utilize efficiently and expeditiously the assistance for which application is made. In determining the incidence of poverty the Director shall consider information available with respect to such factors as: the concentration of low-income families, particularly those with children; the extent of persistent unemployment and underemployment; the number and proportion of persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; the number of migrant or transient low-income families; school dropout rates, military service rejection rates, and other evidence of low educational attainment; the incidence of disease, disability, and infant mortality; housing conditions; adequacy of community facilities and services; and the incidence of crime and juvenile delinquency.

[(d) The Director is authorized to make grants under this section for special programs (1) which involve activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, (2) which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands, and (3) which are conducted in accordance with standards adequate to assure that the program is in the public interest and otherwise consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment.

[(e) The Director is authorized to make grants or enter into agreements with any State or local agency or private organization to pay all or part of the costs of adult work training and employment programs for unemployed or low-income persons involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including, but not

limited to, health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. Such programs shall (1) assist in developing entry level employment opportunities, (2) provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, and (3) be combined with necessary educational, training, counseling, and transportation assistance, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Such work experience shall be combined, where needed, with educational and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training. Such program shall be conducted in a manner consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment.

[(f) In extending assistance under this section the Director shall give special consideration to programs which give promise of effecting a permanent increase in the capacity of individuals, groups, and communities to deal with their problems without further assistance and to programs which make the maximum utilization of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.

[(g) The Director shall carry out this part in such a manner as to insure that funds available for carrying out this part (other than those available for carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of this section, and sections 206(b), 211-1(a), 211-1(b), 211-2 and 211-3) at least 5 per centum will be used for carrying out independently funded community action programs (other than programs described in subsections (d) and (e) of this section, and sections 206(b), 211-1(a), 211-1(b), 211-2 and 211-3) which are carried on in communities in which there is being carried on concurrently a community action program for which an overall community action agency assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating community-wide antipoverty programs and provides for the involvement and participation of public and private nonprofit agencies. In addition the Director may use an additional 5 per centum of such funds for carrying out such programs. For purposes of this subsection, a program will be deemed to be independently funded if the grantee is one that develops, and is funded to operate only, programs which are of limited scope and which does not have broad comprehensive community representation on its policymaking board, whether or not the grantee sponsors one or several component programs.

[(h) The Director shall make grants to, or contracts with, independently funded public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations in predominantly rural areas in accordance with sections 210 and 617, where the Director determines it is not feasible, within a reasonable period of time, to establish community action agencies.

[(i) If projects are of a regional nature and can be more efficiently operated on this basis, the Director may make grants to, or contract with, independently funded, public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations for the conduct and administration of such projects.

[(j) No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be an executive officer or a member of the board of directors of any organization (other than a religious organization) with which the Director has entered into a contract under this section to carry out a community action program or a component program thereof.

[(k) No funds shall be released to any public or private nonprofit agency, or combination thereof, under this section unless the grantee organization has submitted to the Director either—

[(1) a statement from the appropriate public financial officer of the community or of the public agency which will maintain the accounts of the grantee, stating that such officer accepts responsibility for providing financial services adequate to insure the establishment and maintenance of an accounting system by such agency and its delegate agencies with internal controls adequate to safeguard the assets of such agencies, check the accuracy and reliability of accounting data, promote operational efficiency and encourage adherence to prescribed management policies; or

[(2) an opinion from a Certified Public Accountant or a duly licensed public accountant stating that the grantee has established such an accounting system.

[(l) (1) The Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey within 3 months after the effective date of a grant or contract with any public or private nonprofit agency, or combination thereof, under this section to review and evaluate the adequacy of the grantee organization's and its delegate agencies' accounting systems and internal controls.

[(2) Within 30 days of the completion of such survey, the Director shall determine on the basis of the findings and conclusions resulting from such survey whether the accounting systems of the grantee organization and its delegate agencies meet the standards set forth in subsections (k)(1) and (k)(2). If he shall determine that the standards have not been met, he shall immediately notify the grantee organization of his determination and he shall consider whether suspension of further payment of Federal funds under the subject grant is warranted.

[(3) In the event of suspension of any grant funds pursuant to subsection (l)(2), the affected agency shall be given not more than six months from the date of notice of suspension in which to establish, with the advice of Office of Economic Opportunity auditors, the procedures prescribed in subsection (k). A new audit shall be performed within this period and if, by the end of this period, the Director is still unable to determine that the accounting system meets the required standards he shall terminate the contract or grant.

[(m) The Director shall establish such rules and regulations as may be required to insure that public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, maintain the standards of accounting set forth in sections 205(k) (1) and (2) during the period of any grant or contract under this section.

[(n) In extending assistance under this section the Director is authorized to make grants for the payment of a reasonable allowance per meeting for attendance at community action agency board meetings or neighborhood community action council or committee meetings and for the reimbursement of other necessary expenses of attendance at such meetings to members of such boards, councils, or committees who are residents of the areas and members of the groups served in order to insure and encourage their maximum feasible participation in the development, conduct, and administration of community action programs: *Provided, however,* That no such payments shall be made for attendance at more than two meetings in a month, or to any

person who is an employee of the United States Government, of a community action agency, or of a State or local governmental agency.

[(o) (1) In making grants for programs in the field of family planning the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this part which have been established by the community action agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies.

[(2) No such grant shall be approved unless it contains and is supported by reasonable assurances that in carrying out any program assisted by any such grant, the applicant will establish and follow procedures designed to insure that—

[(A) no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision or supplies which such individual states to be inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

[(B) no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless such individual has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.

[(3) The use of family planning services provided by the applicant under such grant shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

[TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EMERGENCY LOANS

[SEC. 206. (a) The Director is authorized to provide, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs, and (2) training for specialized or other personnel needed to develop, conduct, or administer such programs or to provide services or other assistance in connection with such programs or otherwise pertaining to the purposes of this part. The Director may, upon request of a grantee under this section, or sections 204, 205, or 209(b), make special assignments of personnel to the grantee to assist and advise in the performance of functions related to the purposes of this part, except that in no event shall more than one hundred persons be employed for, or at any one time regularly engaged in, such assignments, nor shall any such special assignment be for a period of more than two years in the case of any grantee.

[(b) The Director shall also formulate and carry out a program for making small loans to persons in low-income families to meet immediate and urgent family needs. The total outstanding balance of loans made to an individual under this subsection may not at any time exceed \$300. Loans under this subsection shall bear interest at the rate of 2 per centum per annum and shall be made on such other terms and conditions as the Director may prescribe.

[RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS

[SEC. 207. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants to or enter into contracts with institutions of higher education or other appropriate public agencies or private organizations for the conduct of research, and demonstrations pertaining to the purposes of this part. Expenditures under this section in any fiscal year shall not ex-

ceed 5 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated for such year to carry out the purposes of this part. No grant or contract for a research or demonstration project shall be made under this section after January 1, 1967, except pursuant to an overall plan setting forth specific objectives to be achieved under this section and setting forth priorities among such objectives. Such plan, to the extent it contemplates activities or programs that may be undertaken by other Federal agencies or the making of grants or contracts that might be made by other Federal agencies having demonstration and research responsibilities, shall be approved by the Director only after consultation with such agencies. The Director shall include as part of the annual report required by section 608, or as a separate and simultaneous report, a description of the principal research and demonstration activities undertaken during each fiscal year under this part, a statement indicating the relation of such activities to the plan and the policies of this Act, and a statement with respect to each such category, describing the results or findings of such research and demonstration activities, or indicating the time or period, and to the extent possible the manner, in which the benefits or expected benefits of such activities will or are expected to be realized. The Director shall require that all applications or proposals for research or demonstrations shall be filed simultaneously in the appropriate regional office of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and shall require such offices to review and make recommendations with respect thereto within fifteen days from the date of filing.

[LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE]

[SEC. 208. (a)] Assistance pursuant to sections 204 and 205 paid for the period ending June 30, 1967 shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs referred to in those sections, respectively, and thereafter shall not exceed 80 per centum of such costs, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentages is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

[(b)] The Director is authorized to prescribe regulations establishing objective criteria pursuant to which assistance may be reduced below 90 per centum for such community action programs or components as have received assistance under section 205 for a period prescribed in such regulations.

[(c)] The expenditures or contributions made from non-Federal sources for a community action program or component thereof shall be in addition to the aggregate expenditures or contributions from non-Federal sources which were being made for similar purposes prior to the extension of Federal assistance. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a literal application of such requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

【PARTICIPATION OF STATE AGENCIES

【SEC. 209. (a) The Director shall establish procedures which will facilitate effective participation of the States in community action programs including, but not limited to, consultation with appropriate State agencies on the development, conduct, and administration of such programs.

【(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in providing technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering community action programs.

【(c) In carrying out the provisions of part B of title I and title II of this Act, no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this part: *Provided, however,* That this section shall not apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

【(d) When the Director receives an application from a private nonprofit agency for a community action program to be carried on in a community in which there is a community action agency carrying on a number of component programs, he shall, within five days, give notice to such community action agency and the Governor of the State in which the community is located of the receipt of such application. When the Director determines that a separate contract or grant is desirable and practical and that good cause has been shown, he is authorized to make a grant directly to, or to contract directly with, such agency.

【(e) No private institution or organization shall be eligible for participation under this part unless it (1) is itself an institution or organization which has, prior to its consideration for such participation, had a concern with problems of poverty, or (2) is sponsored by one or more such institutions or organizations or by a public agency, or (3) is an institution of higher education (as defined by section 401(f) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963).

【EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

【SEC. 210. The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this part within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing such criteria, he shall consider the relative numbers in the States or areas therein of (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-grade education; (6)

persons rejected for military service; and (7) persons living in urban places compared to the number living in rural places as determined by the Bureau of the Census for the 1960 census.

[PREFERENCE FOR COMPONENTS OF APPROVED PROGRAMS

[SEC. 211. In determining whether to extend assistance under this Act, the Director shall, to the extent feasible, give preference to programs and projects which are components of a community action program approved pursuant to this part.

[HEADSTART AND LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

[SEC. 211-1. (a) In carrying out sections 204 and 205, the Director shall carry out programs eligible for assistance under such sections which assist young children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance and which include (1) the furnishing of such comprehensive health, nutritional, social, educational, and mental health services as the Director finds will aid such children to attain their greatest potential, (2) the provision of appropriate activities to encourage the participation of parents of such children and the effective use of their services, and (3) such other training, technical assistance, evaluation, and follow-through activities as may be necessary or appropriate.

[(b) In carrying out sections 204 and 205, the Director shall carry out programs eligible for assistance under such sections, which provide legal advice and legal representation to persons when they are unable to afford the services of a private attorney, together with legal research and information as appropriate to mobilize the assistance of lawyers or legal institutions, or combinations thereof, to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty: *Provided*, That the Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed program of legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to review the proposed program and to submit comments and recommendations thereon before such program is approved or funded.

[COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH SERVICES PROGRAMS

[SEC. 211-2. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or to contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies in order to provide assistance necessary for the development and implementation of comprehensive health services programs focused upon the needs of persons residing in urban or rural areas having high concentrations of poverty and a marked inadequacy of health services. Such programs shall be designed—

[(1) to make possible, with maximum feasible utilization of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, including but not limited to preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and follow-up services, together with facilities and rehabilitation necessary in connection therewith; and

[(2) to assure that such services are made readily accessible to the residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation, and wherever possible are

combined with, or included within arrangements for providing, employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served.

Before approving any program under this section, the Director shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps, or impose such conditions, as may be required to make certain that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing services related to this section are furnished with all assistance necessary or appropriate in order to permit them to plan for participation in such program and for the necessary continuation of such services.

[(b) In carrying out this section, the Director shall formulate and carry out programs for the prevention of narcotic addiction and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. Such programs shall include provisions for the detoxification, guidance, training, and job placement of narcotic addicts.

[(c) The Director, either separately or as part of the annual report required under section 608, shall submit at least annually to the Congress a comprehensive statement describing the actions taken and progress made under this section and all other provisions of this Act in meeting the needs of the poor for expanded and improved health services. The Director shall also provide for studies of the nature and characteristics of health problems particularly significant to low-income persons.

[(d) The Director is authorized, after consultation with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to secure (by grant or contract) objective studies of the overall operation of the programs authorized under this section, including their relationship to and impact on the adequacy and availability of all relevant programs and services for meeting total health needs. Reports of such studies, together with such comments and recommendations as the Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may care to offer, shall be submitted to the President and the Congress.

[SPECIAL PROJECTS ON ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

[SEC. 211-3. The Director is authorized to make grants to local educational agencies and to other public or private nonprofit agencies for the purpose of special projects in the field of adult basic education for low-income individuals over eighteen years of age whose lack of basic educational skills constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability. Such projects shall—

[(1) involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs which the Director determines may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this title,

[(2) involve activities in adult basic education which the Director determines are so coupled with other Federal, federally assisted, State, or local programs, as to have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of low-income individuals with basic education deficiencies, or

[(3) show promise of enabling persons receiving welfare payments or other forms of public assistance to obtain employment which will permit discontinuance of such assistance.

【PART B—ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS—REPEALED

【PART C—VOLUNTARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR NEEDY CHILDREN

【STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

【SEC. 219-1. The purpose of this part is to allow individual Americans to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty, by voluntarily assisting in the support of one or more needy children, in a program coordinated with city or county social welfare agencies.

【AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH INFORMATION CENTER

【SEC. 220. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this part, the Director is authorized to establish a section within the Office of Economic Opportunity to act as an information and coordination center to encourage voluntary assistance for deserving and needy children.

(b) It is the intent of the Congress that the section established pursuant to this part shall act solely as an information and coordination center and that nothing in this part shall be construed as interfering with the jurisdiction of State and local welfare agencies with respect to programs for needy children.

【PART D—DURATION OF PROGRAM

【SEC. 221. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.】

TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 201. The purpose of this title is to assist communities in opening opportunities which enable low-income persons to achieve self-sufficiency.

COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

SEC. 202. (a) To achieve this purpose, communities shall be encouraged and aided to plan and conduct community action programs designed to—

(1) provide services and assistance, including innovative approaches, which enable low-income persons to achieve economic independence; to improve their living conditions, and to increase their participation in community activities;

(2) stimulate agencies and institutions which provide services and assistance to low-income persons to expand, modify, and improve their programs so as to serve such persons more effectively; and

(3) mobilize, utilize, and coordinate all relevant public and private resources in a comprehensive program which opens opportunities to low-income persons.

(b) There shall be maximum feasible participation of residents of the areas and members of the groups served in the planning, conduct, administration, and evaluation of all components of a community action pro-

gram. There shall be maximum emphasis upon local initiative and responsibility.

PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND DELEGATE AGENCIES

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

SEC. 210. The Director shall encourage the formation of community action agencies. A community action agency may be either a public or private nonprofit agency. It shall be responsible for and must be capable of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating a community action program. It shall serve as the prime sponsor for all financial assistance provided to its community under sections 220 and 221 (except as otherwise provided in sections 220(c) and 221(a)). It shall have adequate authority (1) to administer funds received under this title and from other public and private sources, (2) to transfer and delegate such funds to other agencies, and (3) to contract with public or private organizations. It shall conform to such other criteria as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions of this title.

COMMUNITIES

SEC. 211. For the purpose of this title, a community may be a city, county, multicity, or multicounty unit, an Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suitable organizational base and possesses the commonality of interest needed for a community action program. The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to work and training programs, physical and economic development, housing, education, health, and other community services to encourage the establishment of coterminous or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and community action programs assisted under this title.

STATEWIDE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

SEC. 212. A statewide or regional agency may be a community action agency for the purpose of planning, conducting, administering and evaluating programs in a number of rural areas of small communities until a satisfactory community agency is established. Such agency must operate in a manner consistent with sections 201 and 202, including the participation and representation requirements of section 213.

GOVERNING BOARD

SEC. 213. (a) A community action agency shall be governed by a board which is broadly representative of the community and which is organized to provide for the membership of both the public and private sectors.

(b) At least one-third of the membership of the board shall be persons who are selected by residents of the areas and members of the groups served. Each community action agency shall establish procedures by which appropriate representation is provided (1) to poor persons living in neighborhoods where poverty is concentrated and (2) to other poor persons including the elderly and rural residents living outside these neighborhoods. All members of the governing board selected to represent specific geographic areas must reside in the area they represent.

(c) *The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which community agencies and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented on the governing board may petition for adequate representation.*

POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNING BOARD

SEC. 214. (a) The governing board of a community action agency shall be empowered to—

- (1) establish adequate personnel policies and fiscal controls;*
- (2) approve overall plans, adopt and enforce program policies, and approve all proposals for financial assistance under this title; and*
- (3) provide for periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of the community action program and its components.*

(b) Each community action agency shall provide for reasonable public access to books, records and other information and for opportunity for public hearing at the request of local groups.

DELEGATE AGENCIES

SEC. 215. (a) Each community action agency shall be encouraged to make use of delegate agencies to carry out components of the community action program. Such agencies shall consist of (1) neighborhood based organizations formed to carry out programs under this Act, which shall be encouraged to have at least one-half of the governing board composed of residents of the area or members of the groups served, or (2) other delegate agencies which shall be required to establish effective procedures by which such persons will be enabled to influence the character of programs affecting their interests. A delegate agency may be a public agency or private organization. Each delegate agency must be capable of conducting the program or programs, shall have adequate personnel policies and fiscal controls, shall provide for reasonable public access to books, records, and other information, and shall cooperate in the evaluation of programs.

(b) The community action agency shall encourage the establishment of housing development and services organizations designed to focus on the housing needs of low-income families and individuals. Such organizations shall provide the technical, administrative, and financial assistance which is required to help low-income families and individuals more effectively to utilize existing programs, and which is required to enable nonprofit, cooperative, and public sponsors more effectively to take advantage of existing Federal, State, and local mortgage insurance and housing assistance programs. Where appropriate, such organizations may be nonprofit housing development corporations. Such corporations may themselves become sponsors of housing under existing programs of specialized housing agencies, but under no circumstances shall such corporations insure mortgages or duplicate the long-term capital financing functions of programs now administered by the specialized housing agencies. Housing development and service organizations shall coordinate their efforts with other community action agency efforts so that any programs undertaken under authority of this subsection shall be closely related to other community action programs.

*PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS
AND RELATED ACTIVITIES*

GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 220. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies for the planning, conduct, administration and evaluation of community action programs and components. Those components may involve national emphasis program activities as described in section 221 and, without limitation, other activities and supporting facilities designed to assist participants including the elderly poor—

- (1) to secure and retain meaningful employment;*
- (2) to attain an adequate education;*
- (3) to make better use of available income;*
- (4) to provide and maintain adequate housing and a suitable living environment;*
- (5) to undertake family planning, consistent with personal and family goals, religious and moral convictions;*
- (6) to obtain services for the prevention of narcotics addiction, alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and alcoholics;*
- (7) to obtain emergency assistance through loans or grants to meet immediate and urgent individual and family needs, including the need for health services, nutritious food, housing, and employment-related assistance;*
- (8) to remove obstacles and solve personal and family problems which block the achievement of self-sufficiency;*
- (9) to achieve greater participation in the affairs of the community; and*
- (10) to make more frequent and effective use of other programs related to the purposes of this title.*

He may also provide financial assistance to other public or private non-profit agencies to aid them in planning for the establishment of a community action agency.

(b) After July 1, 1968, the Director shall require, as a condition of assistance, that each community action agency has adopted a systematic approach to the achievement of the purposes of this title and to the utilization of funds provided under this part. Such systematic approach shall encompass a planning and implementation process which seeks to identify the problems and causes of poverty in the community, seeks to mobilize and coordinate relevant public and private resources, establishes program priorities, links program components with one another and with other relevant programs, and provides for evaluation. The Director may, however, extend the time for such requirement to take into account the length of time a program has been in operation. He shall also take necessary steps to assure the participation of other Federal agencies in support of the development and implementation of plans under this subsection.

(c) The Director may and is encouraged to provide financial assistance to a public agency or private organization other than a community action agency to carry out one or more component programs under this section and section 221 when he determines, after soliciting and considering comments of the community action agency, if any, that such assistance would enhance program participation or acceptance on the part of persons served and would serve the purposes of this title.

(d) At least 50 per centum of the funds authorized and appropriated for this title shall be utilized to finance component programs under this section and section 221 which are locally selected to respond to particular community needs.

(e) In order to promote local responsibility and initiative, the Director shall not establish binding national priorities on funds authorized by this section, but he shall review each application for financial assistance on its merits. Before extending financial assistance to a new community action agency under this section and under section 221, and in determining the amount of and conditions on which such assistance shall be extended, the Director shall consider the extent and nature of poverty in the community and the probable capacity of the agency to carry out an effective program. In reviewing or supplementing financial assistance to a previously existing community action agency, he shall consider the progress made in carrying on programs by such agency.

NATIONAL EMPHASIS PROGRAMS

SEC. 221. (a) The Director may reserve funds and provide financial assistance for national emphasis programs designed to deal with needs of the poor which are common to a number of communities. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b)(5) and section 220(c), such financial assistance shall be provided through community action agencies, unless (1) the community action agency chooses not to undertake that responsibility, or (2) the community action agency fails to demonstrate affirmatively its capability to undertake this responsibility, or (3) there is no community action agency in the area. Community action agencies shall be encouraged to make maximum use of delegate agencies to operate such programs.

(b) Among the national emphasis programs shall be the following:

(1) A program to be known as Headstart focused upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance which will provide such comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services, as the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full potential, together with appropriate activities to encourage the participation of parents of such children and permit the effective use of parent services.

(2) A program to be known as Follow Through focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or elementary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive services and parent participation activities as described in paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the continued development of children to their full potential.

(3) A "legal services program" to further the cause of justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing legal advice, legal representation, counseling education, and other appropriate services. Projects involving legal advice and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar associations in the area to be served by any proposed project for legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on the proposal before it is approved or funded.

(4) A "comprehensive health services program". This shall include—

(A) programs to aid in developing and carrying out comprehensive health services projects focused upon the needs of urban and rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of poverty and marked inadequacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

(i) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, such as preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, family planning, narcotic addiction and alcoholism prevention and rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and followup services, together with necessary related facilities and services; and

(ii) to assure that these services are made readily accessible to low-income residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are combined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served: Provided, however, That such services may be made available on an emergency basis or pending a determination of eligibility to all residents of such areas.

Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary to pay the full costs of projects. Before approving any project, the Director shall solicit and consider the comments and recommendations of the principal local medical associations in the area and shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure that the program will be carried on under competent professional supervision and that existing agencies providing related services are furnished all assistance needed to permit them to plan for participation in the program and for the necessary continuation of those related services; and

(B) programs to provide financial assistance to public or private agencies for projects designed to develop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health services for the poor. Such projects shall encourage both prospective and practicing health professionals to direct their talents and energies toward providing health services for the poor. In carrying out the provisions of this paragraph, the Director is authorized to provide or arrange for training and study in the field of health services for the poor. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by him, the Director may arrange for the payment of stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) for persons undergoing such training and study and for their dependents. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall achieve effective coordination of programs and projects authorized under this section with other related activities.

(5) A program to be known as Upward Bound designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher education

and one or more secondary schools. They must include a curriculum designed to develop creative thinking, effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for post-secondary educational success, necessary health services and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the Director determines may be appropriate. Financial assistance for such projects may be provided directly to institutions of higher learning, but the projects shall be closely coordinated with activities of community action agencies and with the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(6) A program to be known as Project Find designed to identify and meet the needs of poor persons above the age of 60 in one or more of the following areas: effective referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal and consumer assistance, recreation, and other services; stimulation of additional services and programs to remedy gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and programs; provision of new employment and volunteer opportunities; increased participation in community activities and programs; modification of existing procedures and eligibility requirements to facilitate greater use of and participation in public services by the older poor; development of all-season recreation centers; and such other activities and services as the Director may determine are necessary or specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor.

(7) A "family planning program" to provide assistance and services to low-income persons in the field of voluntary family planning, including the provision of information, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concerning, family planning projects within their respective jurisdictions in order to assure the maximum availability of services and in order best to meet the varying needs of different communities. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall make the services of Public Health Services officers available to the Director in carrying out this program.

(c) Consistent with, and subject, to the provisions of section 232, programs under this section may include related training, research, and technical assistance, and funds allocated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to training, research, and technical assistance activities.

RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 222. In the conduct of all component programs under this part, residents of the area and members of the groups served shall be provided maximum employment opportunity, including opportunity for further occupational training and career advancement. The Director shall encourage the employment of persons fifty-five years and older as regular, part-time and short-term staff in component programs.

NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

SEC. 223. The Director shall encourage the development of neighborhood centers, designed to promote the effectiveness of needed services in such fields as health, education, manpower, consumer protection, child and economic development, housing, legal, recreation, and social services, and so organized (through a corporate or other appropriate framework) as to promote maximum participation of neighborhood residents in center

planning, policymaking, administration, and operation. In addition to providing such services as may not otherwise be conveniently or readily available, such centers shall be responsive to such neighborhood needs as counseling, referral, follow-through, and community development activities as may be necessary or appropriate to best assure a system under which existing programs are extended to the most disadvantaged, are linked to one another, are responsive and relevant to the range of community, family, and individual problems and are fully adapted to neighborhood needs and conditions.

ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

SEC. 224. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or allocated for assistance in the development and implementation of community action programs pursuant to section 220 and for national emphasis programs referred to in section 221(a), and which are not subject to any other provision governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That part of any State allotment which the Director determines will not be needed may be reallocated, on such dates during the fiscal year as the Director may fix, to other States, in proportion to their original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States.

(b) The Director may provide for the separate allotment of funds for any national emphasis program referred to in section 221(a) except Headstart. This allotment may be made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsection (a), or it may be made in accordance with criteria which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the needs or problems at which the program is directed, except that in no event may more than 12½ per centum of the funds for any one program be used in any one State.

(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial assistance extended to a community action agency or other agency pursuant to sections 220 and 221 shall not exceed 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted programs or activities. The Director may, however, approve assistance in excess of such percentage if he determines, in accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria, that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, or services. If in any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceeding its requirements under this section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for such contributions under section 131.

(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under sections 220 and 221, unless the Director satisfies himself (1) that the services to provided under such program will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services previously provided without Federal assistance, (2) that, to the extent that in-school educational services previously provided with or without Federal assistance can be expanded and adapted to meet more effectively (A) the needs of the poor within the community and (B) the purposes of the assistance to be extended under this title, the agency providing such services shall be utilized, and (3) that funds or other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the needs of the poor within the community will not be diminished in order to provide any contributions required under subsection (c) or otherwise qualify for assistance under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a strict application of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved.

PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assistance to communities in planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating programs under this title, and (2) training of specialized or other personnel which are needed to achieve the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiving financial assistance under this title, the Director may make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist and advise it in the performance of functions related to the assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE—SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO GOVERNORS

SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to appropriate State agencies to enable those agencies—

(1) to provide technical assistance to communities and local agencies in developing and carrying out programs under this title;

(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related to this title;

(3) to advise and assist the Director in developing procedures and programs to promote the participation of States and State agencies in programs under this title; and

(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Economic Opportunity Council established by section 631 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or administrative requirements that operate to impede State level coordination of programs related to this title, and in developing methods or recommendations for overcoming those problems.

(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the Director shall give preference to programs or activities which are administered or coordinated by the agencies assisted pursuant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State agencies, the Director may

enter into agreements with States or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of the United States for purposes of providing financial assistance to community action agencies or other local agencies in connection with specific projects or types of projects involving the common or joint use of State funds and funds under this title.

(d) In carrying out the provisions of part B of title I and title II no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local public agency or any private institution or organization for the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other activity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this part. This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agreements, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of higher education in existence on the date of the approval of this Act.

RESEARCH AND PILOT PROJECTS

SEC. 232. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance for pilot projects conducted by public agencies or private organizations which are designed to assist in the development of new approaches that will aid in furthering the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes of this title.

(b) Before approving any contract or grant for a pilot project in a community which has a community action agency, the Director shall solicit and consider the views of that agency on the proposed project.

(c) The Director shall develop and carry out pilot projects (1) which aid elderly persons to achieve greater self-sufficiency, (2) which focus upon the problems of rural poverty, (3) which are designed to develop new techniques and community-based efforts to prevent narcotics addiction or to rehabilitate narcotic addicts, and (4) which are designed to encourage the participation of private organizations, other than nonprofit organizations, in programs under this title.

(d) The Director shall establish an overall plan to govern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects and determining whether the findings resulting from any research or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate annual report, the Director shall submit a description for each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section, of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived from those activities, together with a statement indicating the time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be realized.

(e) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be used for the purposes of this section.

EVALUATION

SEC. 233. (a) The Director shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this part, including their effectiveness in achieving stated goals their impact on related programs and their structure and mechanism for the delivery of services and including where appropriate, comparisons with proper control groups composed of persons who have not participated in such programs. He may, for this purpose contract for independent evaluations of those programs or individual projects. He shall also arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the programs. The results of such evaluation shall be included in the report required by section 608.

(b) The Director shall develop and publish standards for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assistance provided by sections 220, 221, 230, and 231.

PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS—

RURAL AREAS

SEC. 240. (a) The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within the States between urban and rural areas. In developing such criteria, he shall consider the relative number in the States or areas therein of: (1) low-income families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations; (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-grade education; (6) persons rejected for military service; and (7) persons living in urban places compared to the number living in rural places as determined by the latest reports of the Bureau of the Census.

(b) To assure that rural areas are able to utilize their full and equitable share of assistance, the Director shall undertake special efforts to increase the effectiveness of rural community action programs. He shall describe these efforts and their results in the report required by section 608.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

SEC. 241. The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this title are carried on subject to adequate internal controls, accounting requirements, and rules governing personnel standards and policies as may be necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency and the effective use of funds. These regulations shall include provisions governing matters relating to partisan political activities and elections referred to in section 603(b) of this Act.

AUDITS

SEC. 242. (a) Within three months after the effective date of the first grant or contract of assistance with an organization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the adequacy of the accounting system and internal management controls.

(b) *At least once annually the Director shall make or cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assistance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures incurred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appropriate means, including court action or a commensurate increase in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any grant or contract with the same agency or organization which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve months after the date of disallowance.*

SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

SEC. 243. The following special limitations shall apply, as indicated, to programs under this title.

(1) *Financial assistance under this title may include funds to provide a reasonable allowance for attendance at meetings of any community action agency governing board, neighborhood council or committee, as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum feasible participation of members of groups and residents of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses connected with those meetings; but those funds (or matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay allowances in the case of any individual who is a Federal, State, or local government employee, or an employee of a community action agency, or for payment of an allowance to any individual for attendance at more than two meetings a month.*

(2) *No officer or employee of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board, council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee, contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a program receiving financial assistance under this title; but this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serving on a board, council, or committee which does not have any authority or powers in connection with a program assisted under this title.*

(3) *In granting financial assistance for projects or activities in the field of family planning, the Director shall assure that family planning services, including the dissemination of family planning information and medical assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility for assistance under this part which have been established by the assisted agency and who desire such information, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall require, in connection with any such financial assistance, that—*

(A) *no individual will be provided with any information, medical supervision, or supplies which that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and*

(B) *no individual will be provided with any medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has voluntarily requested such medical supervision or supplies.*

The use of family planning services assisted under this title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services from or participation in any other programs under this Act.

(4) *No financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide general or curricular aid to education in any school or school system other than for special health, welfare, remedial, and other noncurricular services designed to encourage successful participation in school.*

(5) *In extending assistance under this title the Director shall give special consideration to programs which make maximum use of existing schools, community centers, settlement houses, and other facilities during times they are not in use for their primary purpose.*

(6) *In extending assistance under this title for supplemental educational services of the type not prohibited by paragraph (4) of this section, the Director shall make maximum use of the services of the Commissioner of Education, and of State and local educational agencies.*

DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 244. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

TITLE III—SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS

PART A—RURAL LOAN PROGRAM

【STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

【*SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this title to meet some of the special problems of rural poverty and thereby raise and maintain the income and living standards of low-income rural families and migrant agricultural employees and their families.*】

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some of the special needs of low-income rural families by establishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintaining their income and living standards.

【PART A—AUTHORITY TO MAKE LOANS】

LOANS TO FAMILIES

SEC. 302. (a) The Director is authorized to make loans having a maximum maturity of 15 years and in amounts not resulting in an aggregate principal indebtedness of more than \$3,500 at any one time to any low income rural family where, in the judgment of the Director, such loans have a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families by assisting or permitting them to—

(A) *acquire or improve real estate or reduce encumbrances or erect improvements thereon,*

(B) *operate or improve the operation of farms not larger than family sized, including but not limited to the purchase of feed, seed, fertilizer, livestock, poultry, and equipment, or*

(C) participate in cooperative associations; and/or to finance non-agricultural enterprises which will enable such families to supplement their income.

(b) Loans under this section shall be made only if the family is not qualified to obtain such funds by loan under other Federal programs.

COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS

SEC. 303. The Director is authorized to make loans to local cooperative associations furnishing essential processing, purchasing, or marketing services, supplies, or facilities predominantly to low-income rural families.

LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

SEC. 304. No financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part unless the Director determines that—

(a) the providing of such assistance will materially further the purposes of this part, and

(b) in the case of assistance provided pursuant to section 303, the applicant is fulfilling or will fulfill a need for services, facilities, or activities which is not otherwise being met.

LOAN TERMS AND CONDITIONS

SEC. 305. Loans pursuant to sections 302 and 303 shall have such terms and conditions as the Director shall determine, subject to the following limitations:

(a) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(b) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

(c) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Director may determine to be consistent with its purposes;

(e) with respect to loans made pursuant to section 303, the loan is repayable within not more than thirty years; and

(f) no financial or other assistance shall be provided under this part to or in connection with any corporation or cooperative organization for the production of agricultural commodities or for manufacturing purposes: *Provided*, That (1) packing, canning, cooking, freezing, or other processing used in preparing or marketing edible farm products, including dairy products, shall not be regarded as manufacturing merely by reason of the fact that it results in the creation of a new or different substance; and (2) a cooperative organization formed by and consisting of members of an Indian tribe (including any tribe with whom the special Federal relationship with Indians has been terminated) engaged in the production of agricultural commodities, or in manufacturing products, on an Indian reservation (or former reservation in the case of tribes with whom the

special Federal relationship with Indians has been terminated) shall not be regarded as a cooperative organization within the purview of this clause.

REVOLVING FUND

SEC. [606.] 306 (a) To carry out the lending and guaranty functions authorized under [titles III of this Act,] *this part* there is authorized to be established a revolving fund. The capital of the fund shall consist of such amounts as may be advanced to it by the Director from funds appropriated pursuant to section 321 and shall remain available until expended.

(b) The Director shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the capital of the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity during the last month of the preceding fiscal year. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest.

(c) Whenever any capital in the fund is determined by the Director to be in excess of current needs, such capital shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced, where it shall be held for future advances.

(d) Receipts from any lending and guaranty operations under this Act (except operations under title IV carried on by the Small Business Administration) shall be credited to the fund. The fund shall be available for the payment of all expenditures of the Director for loans, participations, and guaranties authorized under [titles III of this Act.] *this part*.

[PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEASONALLY EMPLOYED, AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES AND THEIR FAMILIES

[SEC. 311. The Director is authorized to develop and implement a program of loans, loan guarantees, and grants to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions, and cooperatives in establishing, administering, and operating programs which will meet, or substantially and primarily contribute to meeting, the special needs of migratory workers and seasonal farm laborers and their families in the fields of housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children.]

PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEASONALLY EMPLOYED, FARMWORKERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 311. *The purpose of this part is to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly complex and technological society.*

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 312. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions and cooperatives in developing and carrying out programs to fulfill the purpose of this part.

(b) Programs assisted under this part may include projects or activities—

(1) to meet the immediate needs of migrant and seasonal farm-workers and their families, such as day care for children, education, health services, improved housing and sanitation (including the provision and maintenance of emergency and temporary housing and sanitation facilities), legal advice and representation, and consumer training and counseling;

(2) to promote increased community acceptance of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families; and

(3) to equip unskilled migrant and seasonal farm-workers and members of their families as appropriate through education and training to meet the changing demands in agricultural employment brought about by technological advancement and to take advantage of opportunities available to improve their well-being and self-sufficiency by gaining regular or permanent employment or by participating in available Government training programs.

LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

SEC. 313. (a) Assistance shall not be extended under this part unless the Director determines that the applicant will maintain its prior level of effort in similar activities.

(b) The Director shall establish necessary procedures or requirements to assure that programs under this part are carried on in coordination with other programs or activities providing assistance to the persons and groups served.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 314. (a) The Director may provide directly or through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, such technical assistance or training of personnel as may be required to implement effectively the purposes of this title.

(b) The Director shall provide for necessary evaluation of projects under this title and may, through grants or contracts, secure independent evaluation for this purpose. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.

PART C—DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 321. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

PART D—INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

SEC. 331. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make indemnity payments, at a fair market value, to dairy farmers who have been directed since January 1, 1964, to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government at the time of such use. Such indemnity payments shall continue to each dairy farmer until he has been reinstated and is again allowed to dispose of his milk on commercial markets.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The authority granted under this section shall expire on June 30, [1967.] 1968.

TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 401. It is the purpose of this title to assist in the establishment, preservation, and strengthening of small business concerns and improve the managerial skills employed in such [enterprises;] *enterprises, with special attention to small business concerns (1) located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or (2) owned by low-income individuals; and to mobilize for these objectives private as well as public managerial skills and resources.*

LOANS, PARTICIPATIONS, AND GUARANTIES

SEC. 402. (a) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration is authorized to make, participate (on an immediate basis) in, or guarantee loans, repayable in not more than fifteen years, to any small business concern (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) and regulations issued thereunder), or to any qualified person seeking to establish such a concern, when he determines that such loans will assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, with particular emphasis on [employment of the long-term unemployed:] *the preservation or establishment of small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals: Provided, however, That no such loans shall be made, participated in, or guaranteed if the total of such Federal assistance to a single borrower outstanding at any one time would exceed \$25,000. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration may defer payments on the principal of such loans for a grace period and use such other methods as he deems necessary and appropriate to assure the successful establishment and operation of such concern. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration may, in his discretion, as a condition of such financial assistance, require that the borrower take steps to improve his management skills by participating in a management training program approved by the Administrator of the Small Business [Administration.] Administration: Provided, however, That any management training program so approved must be of sufficient scope and duration to provide*

reasonable opportunity for the individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall encourage, as far as possible, the participation of the private business community in the program of assistance to such concerns.

[(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to, or contract with, public or private nonprofit agencies, or combinations thereof, to pay all or part of the costs necessary to enable such agencies to provide screening, counseling, management guidance, or similar assistance with respect to persons or small business concerns which receive or may be eligible for assistance under subsection (a). Financial assistance under this subsection shall be subject to the provisions of section 208 of this Act.]

(b) To the extent necessary or appropriate to carry out the programs provided for in this title the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall have the same powers as are conferred upon the Director by section 602 of this Act.

LOAN TERMS AND CONDITIONS

SEC. 403. Loans made pursuant to section 402 (including immediate participation in and guaranties of such loans) shall have such terms and conditions as the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall determine, subject to the following limitations—

(a) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

(b) the financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

(c) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure completion of the project or achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

(d) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (1) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (2) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Administrator of the Small Business Administration may determine to be consistent with its purposes: *Provided, however,* That the rate of interest charged on loans made in redevelopment areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) shall not exceed the rate currently applicable to new loans made under section 6 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 2505); and

(e) fees not in excess of amounts necessary to cover administrative expenses and probable losses may be required on loan guaranties.

[LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

[SEC. 404. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small Business Administration determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another or in financing subcontractors to enable them to undertake work theretofore performed in another area by other subcontractors or contractors.]

DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to this part are allotted to small business concerns located in urban areas identified by the Director as having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Director shall jointly define the meaning of low income as it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to be assisted under this part, and such definition need not correspond to the definition of low income as used elsewhere in this Act.

LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small Business Administration or the Secretary of Commerce determines that the assistance will be used in relocating establishments from one area to another if such relocation would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private organizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed to provide technical and management assistance to individuals or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402, with special attention to small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.

(b) Financial assistance under this section may be provided for projects, including without limitation—

(1) planning and research, including feasibility studies and market research;

(2) the identification and development of new business opportunities, and the stimulation of new private capital resources through the use of guarantees, pooling arrangements, or otherwise;

(3) the furnishing of centralized services with regard to public services and government programs, including programs authorized under section 402;

(4) the establishment and strengthening of business service agencies, including trade associations and cooperatives;

(5) the encouragement of the placement of subcontracts by major businesses with small business concerns located in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-income individuals, including the provision of incentives and assistance to such major businesses so that they will aid in the training and upgrading of potential subcontractors or other small business concerns; and

(6) the furnishing of business counseling, management training, and legal and other related services, with special emphasis on the development of management training programs using the resources

of the business community, including the development of management training opportunities in existing businesses, and with emphasis in all cases upon providing management training of sufficient scope and duration to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the part of the individuals served.

(c) The Secretary of Commerce shall give preference to projects which promote the ownership, participation in ownership, or management of small business concerns by residents of urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are planned and carried out with the participation of local businessmen.

(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to the individuals and small business concerns served.

(e) The Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Federal Government or in connection with programs aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the purposes of this title.

(f) The Secretary of Commerce shall provide for the continuing evaluation of programs under this section and the results of such evaluation together with recommendations shall be included in the report required by section 608.

DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. [405.] 407. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years.¹

[TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS]

TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND DAY CARE PROGRAMS

PART A—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 501. It is the purpose of this [title] *part* to expand the opportunities for constructive work experience and other needed training available to persons (including workers in farm families with less than \$1,200 net family income, unemployed heads of families and other needy persons) who are unable to support themselves or their families.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 502. In order to permit the carrying out of work experience and training programs meeting the criteria set forth in part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Director is authorized to transfer funds to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable him (1) to make payments under

section 1115 of the Social Security Act for experimental, pilot, or demonstration projects which provide pretraining services and basic maintenance, health, family, basic education, day care, counseling, and similar supportive services required for such programs, and (2) to reimburse the Secretary of Labor for carrying out the activities described in such part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Costs of such projects and activities shall, notwithstanding the provisions of the Social Security Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, be met entirely from funds appropriated to carry out this [title:] *part*: *Provided*, That such funds may not be used to assist families and individuals insofar as they are otherwise receiving or eligible to receive assistance or social services through a State plan approved under titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

LIMITATIONS ON WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 503. (a) The provisions of paragraphs (1) to (6), inclusive, of section 409 of the Social Security Act, unless otherwise inconsistent with the provisions of this [title,] *part*, shall be applicable with respect to work experience and training programs assisted with funds under this [title.] *part*. The costs of such programs to the United States shall, notwithstanding the provisions of such Act, be met entirely from funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the purpose of this [title.] *part*.

(b) Work experience and training programs shall be so designed that participation of individuals in such programs will not ordinarily exceed 36 months, except that nothing in this subsection shall prevent the provision of necessary and appropriate follow-up services for a reasonable period after an individual has completed work experience and training.

(c) Not more than 12½ percent of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this [title] *part* shall be used within any one state. In the case of any work experience and training program approved on or after July 1, 1968, not more than 80 percent of the costs of projects or activities referred to in section 502 may be paid from funds appropriated or allocated to carry out this [title,] *part*, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines, pursuant to regulations prescribed by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this [title.] *part*. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash, or in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.

DURATION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 504. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this [title] *part* during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

TRANSITION

SEC. 505. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide work experience and training programs authorized by section 261(a) (3) and (4) of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, commencing July 1, 1967.² The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide such work experience and training programs through June 30, 1967, and may also continue to completion those work experience and training programs commenced prior to that date, but in no event shall such programs be extended beyond June 30, 1968. After June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pursuant to agreement with the Secretary of Labor which shall include provisions for joint evaluation and approval of the training and work experience aspect of each project or program, may also—

(1) with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, renew existing projects and programs, or develop and provide new projects or programs, to accomplish the purposes of this [title] *part* and of part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; and

(2) with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, develop and provide other work experience and training programs pursuant to such part E, with respect to such projects or parts of projects which the Secretary of Labor is unable to provide after being given notice and a reasonable opportunity to do so.

Before July 1, 1967, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, for the purposes of this [title] *part* and part E of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, utilize the services and facilities available under the manpower development and utilization programs administered by the Department of Labor which may include, but not be limited to, testing, counseling, job referral and follow-up services required to assist participants in securing and obtaining employment, training opportunities, either on or off the job, available under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and relocation assistance to involuntarily unemployed individuals in accordance with the standards prescribed in section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and shall compensate the Secretary of Labor for the reasonable costs thereof either by advance or reimbursement.

*PART B—DAY CARE PROJECTS**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE*

SEC. 521. The purpose of this part is to provide day care for children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons in order to enable the parents or relatives of such children to choose to undertake or to continue vocational training, basic education, or gainful employment.

GRANTS FOR DAY CARE PROJECTS

SEC. 522. (a) *The Director is authorized to make grants to appropriate public agencies and private organizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of projects under which children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons may receive day care. Such day care projects shall provide health, education, social and such other supportive services as may be needed. Project costs payable under this part may include costs of renovation and alteration of physical facilities. Financial assistance under this section may be provided in conjunction with or to supplement day care projects under the Social Security Act or other relevant statutes.*

(b) *The Director may require a family which is not a low-income family to make payment, in whole or in part, for the day care services provided under this program where the family's financial condition is, or becomes through employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment appropriate.*

(c) *In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall give preference to projects providing day care for children from low-income families or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of low-income persons whose parents or relatives desire to accept employment or to undertake vocational training or basic education under this and other Acts.*

(d) *The Director and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordinate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a common set of program standards and regulations, and mechanisms for coordination at the State and local levels. The Director shall give preference to applicants which show evidence of coordination and cooperation between their projects and other day care programs in the areas which they will serve.*

(e) *Each project to which payments are made hereunder shall provide for a thorough evaluation. This evaluation shall be conducted by such agency or independent public or private organization as the Director shall designate, with a view to determining, among other things, the extent to which the day care provided may have increased the employment of parents and relatives of the children served, the extent to which such day care may have reduced the costs of aid and services to such children, the extent to which such children have received health and educational benefits, and the extent to which the project has been coordinated with other day care activities in the area served. Up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid by the Director from funds appropriated for the purposes of carrying out this part. Such evaluations, together with a report on the program described in this part, shall be included in the report required by section 608.*

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS IN
DAY CARE PROJECTS

SEC. 523. (a) *The Director, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps in the*

operation of vocational training, work experience, and basic education programs under their jurisdiction to train unemployed or low-income individuals in day care projects under this part.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the Director shall give preference to projects in which unemployed or low-income individuals are to be employed including individuals receiving or eligible to receive assistance under the Social Security Act.

DURATION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 524. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years.

TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

PART A—ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 601. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President the Office of Economic Opportunity. The Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There shall also be in the Office one Deputy Director and **[four]** *five* Assistant Directors who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Deputy Director and the Assistant Directors shall perform such functions as the Director may from time to time prescribe.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5(b) of the Reorganization Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 133z-3(b)), at any time after one year from the date of enactment hereof the President may, by complying with the procedures established by that Act, provide for the transfer of the Office from the Executive Office of the President and for its establishment elsewhere in the executive branch as he deems appropriate.

(c) The compensation of the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(d) The compensation of the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

(e) The compensation of the Assistant Directors of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of the annual rate of compensation payable to the Assistant Secretaries of the Executive Departments.

AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR

SEC. 602. In addition to the authority conferred upon him by other sections of this Act, the Director is authorized, in carrying out his functions under this Act, to—

(a) appoint in accordance with the civil service laws such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Office to carry out its functions, and, except as otherwise provided herein, fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.);

(b) employ experts and consultants or organizations thereof as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of \$100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed: *Provided, however, That* contracts for such employment may be renewed annually;

(c) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, one or more advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of the Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to his functions under this Act; and members of such committees (including the National Advisory Council established in section 605), other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government, while attending meetings of such committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Director, shall be entitled to receive compensation and travel expenses as provided in subsection (b) with respect to experts and consultants;

(d) with the approval of the President, arrange with and reimburse the heads of other Federal agencies for the performance of any of his functions under this Act and, as necessary or appropriate, delegate any of his powers under this Act and authorize the redelegation thereof subject to provisions to assure the maximum possible liaison between the Office of Economic Opportunity and such other agencies at all operating levels, which shall include the furnishing of complete operational information by such other agencies to the Office of Economic Opportunity and the furnishing of such information by such Office to such other agencies;

(e) utilize, with their consent, the services and facilities of Federal agencies without reimbursement, and, with the consent of any State or a political subdivision of a State, accept and utilize the services and facilities of the agencies of such State or subdivision without reimbursement;

(f) accept in the name of the Office, and employ or dispose of in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, or of any title thereof, any money, or property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, received by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise;

(g) accept voluntary and uncompensated services, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679(b) of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 665(b));

(h) allocate and expend, or transfer to other Federal agencies for expenditure, funds made available under this Act as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions hereof, including (without regard to the provisions of section 4774(d) of title 10, United States Code) expenditure for construction, repairs, and capital improvements;

(i) disseminate, without regard to the provisions of section 4154 of title 39, United States Code, data and information, in such form as he shall deem appropriate, to public agencies, private organizations, and the general public;

(j) adopt an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(k) notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real or personal property by the United States, deal with, complete, rent, renovate, modernize, or sell for cash or credit at his discretion any properties acquired by him in connection with loans, participations, and guaranties made by him pursuant to titles III and IV of this Act;

(1) collect or compromise all obligations to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of obligations until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(m) expend funds made available for purposes of this Act—

(1) for printing and binding, in accordance with applicable law and regulation; and

(2) without regard to any other law or regulation, for rent of buildings and space in buildings and for repair, alteration, and improvement of buildings and space in buildings rented by him; but the Director shall not utilize the authority contained in this subparagraph (2)—

(A) except when necessary to obtain an item, service, or facility, which is required in the proper administration of this Act, and which otherwise could not be obtained, or could not be obtained in the quantity or quality needed, or at the time, in the form, or under the conditions in which, it is needed, and

(B) prior to having given written notification to the Administrator of General Services (if the exercise of such authority would affect an activity which otherwise would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration) of his intention to exercise such authority, the item, service, or facility with respect to which such authority is proposed to be exercised, and the reasons and justifications for the exercise of such authority; and

(n) establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures, prescribe such rules and regulations, enter into such contracts and agreements with public agencies and private organizations and persons, make such payments (in lump sum or installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in the case of grants, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments), and generally perform such functions and take such steps as he may deem to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

SEC. 603. (a) For purposes of chapter 15 of title 5 of the United States Code any overall community action agency which assumes responsibility for planning, developing, and coordinating community-wide antipoverty programs and receives assistance under this Act shall be deemed to be a State or local agency; and for purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of section 1502(a) of such title any agency receiving assistance under this Act (other than part C of title I) shall be deemed to be a State or local agency.

(b) The Director, after consultation with the Civil Service Commission, is authorized to issue such regulations or impose such requirements as may be necessary or appropriate to supplement the provisions of subsection (a) of this section or otherwise to insure that programs assisted under this Act are not carried on in a manner involving the

use of program funds, the provision of services, or the employment or assignment of personnel in a manner supporting, or resulting in the identification of such program with, any partisan political activity or any activity designed to further the election or defeat of any candidate for public office.

[ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

[SEC. 604. (a) There is hereby established an Economic Opportunity Council, which shall consult with and advise the Director in carrying out his functions, including the coordination of antipoverty efforts by all segments of the Federal Government.

[(b) The Council shall include the Director, who shall be Chairman, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, the Director of Selective Service, and such other agency heads as the President may designate, or delegates thereof.]

APPEALS, NOTICE AND HEARING

SEC. 604. The Director shall prescribe procedures to assure that—

(1) special notice of and an opportunity for a timely and expeditious appeal to the Director is provided for an agency or organization which would like to serve as a delegate agency under title I-B or II and whose application to the prime sponsor or community action agency has been wholly or substantially rejected or has not been acted upon within a period of time deemed reasonable by the Director;

(2) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and III-B shall not be suspended for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions, except in emergency situations, nor shall an application for refunding under sections 123, 220, 221, or 312 be denied, unless the recipient agency has been given reasonable notice and opportunity to show cause why such action should not be taken; and

(3) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and III-B shall not be terminated for failure to comply with applicable terms and conditions unless the recipient agency has been afforded reasonable notice and opportunity for a full and fair hearing.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 605. (a) There is hereby established in the Office a National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity (hereinafter referred to as the Advisory Council), to be composed of twenty-one members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the President. Such members shall be representative of the public in general and appropriate fields of endeavor related to the purposes of this Act. The President shall designate the chairman from among such members. The Advisory Council shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than four times a year. The Director shall be an ex officio member of the Advisory Council.

(b) The Advisory Council shall—

(1) advise the Director with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this Act; and

(2) review the effectiveness and the operation of programs under this Act and make recommendations concerning (A) the improvement of such programs, (B) the elimination of duplication of effort, and (C) the coordination of such programs with other Federal programs designed to assist low income individuals and families.

Such recommendations shall include such proposals for changes in this Act as the Advisory Council deems appropriate.

(c) The Advisory Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning with the calendar year 1967. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

REVOLVING FUND

SEC. 606. (a) To carry out the lending and guaranty functions authorized under titles III of this Act, there is authorized to be established a revolving fund. The capital of the fund shall consist of such amounts as may be advanced to it by the Director from funds appropriated pursuant to section 321 and shall remain available until expended.

(b) The Director shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, at the close of each fiscal year, interest on the capital of the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity during the last month of the preceding fiscal year. Interest payments may be deferred with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but any interest payments so deferred shall themselves bear interest.

(c) Whenever any capital in the fund is determined by the Director to be in excess of current needs, such capital shall be credited to the appropriation from which advanced, where it shall be held for future advances.

(d) Receipts from any lending and guaranty operations under this Act (except operations under title IV carried on by the Small Business Administration) shall be credited to the fund. The fund shall be available for the payment of all expenditures of the Director for loans, participations, and guaranties authorized under titles III of this Act.

LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 607. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the construction, alteration or repair, including painting and decorating of projects, buildings and works which are federally assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to such labor standards, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133—133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, as amended; 40 U.S.C. 276(c)).

REPORTS

SEC. 608. Not later than one hundred and twenty days after the close of each fiscal year, the Director shall prepare and submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress a full and complete report on the activities of the Office during such year.

[DEFINITIONS

[SEC. 609. As used in this Act:

[(a) The term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title II such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and the term "United States", when used in a geographical sense, includes the foregoing and all other places, continental or insular, including the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

[(b) The term "agency", unless the context requires otherwise, means department, agency, or other component of a Federal, State, or local governmental entity.

[(c) The term "family," in the case of a Job Corps enrollee, means—

[(1) the spouse or child of an enrollee, and

[(2) any other relative who draws substantial support from the enrollee.]

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning of "State" shall also include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 224 of this Act this term means only a State or the District of Columbia. The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense includes all those places named in the previous sentence, and all other places continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;

(2) the term "financial assistance" when used in titles I, II, III-B, IV, and V-B includes assistance advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or goods or services; and

(3) the term "permanent resident of the United States" when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee subsequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of sections 214(a) or 212(d)(5), respectively, or any person admitted as a conditional entrant under section 203(a)(7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

[PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

[SEC. 610. It is the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this Act. The

Director shall carry out such investigations and studies, including consultations with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary (1) to develop programs providing employment opportunities, public service opportunities, and education for the elderly poor under the provisions of this Act, and (2) to determine and recommend to the President and the Congress such programs requiring additional authority and the necessary legislation to provide such authority.】

PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

SEC. 610. It is the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this Act. The Director shall (1) carry out such investigations and studies, including consultations with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary to develop and carry out a plan for the participation of the elderly poor in programs under this Act, including programs providing employment opportunities, public service opportunities, education and other services and activities which assist the elderly poor to achieve self-sufficiency; (2) maintain a constant review of all programs under this Act to assure that the needs of the elderly poor are given adequate consideration; (3) initiate and maintain interagency liaison with all other appropriate Federal agencies to achieve a coordinated national approach to the needs of the elderly poor; and (4) determine and recommend to the President and the Congress such programs requiring additional authority and the necessary legislation to provide such authority. The Director shall describe the ways in which this section has been implemented in the annual report required by section 608.

COMPARABILITY OF WAGES

SEC. 【610-1.】 611. (a) The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to assure that persons employed in carrying out programs financed under part A of title I or part A of title II (except a person compensated as provided in section 602) shall not receive compensation at a rate which is (1) in excess of the average rate of compensation paid in the area where the program is carried out to a *substantial number of the persons* providing substantially comparable services, or in excess of the average rate of compensation paid to a *substantial number of the persons* providing substantially comparable services in the area of the person's immediately preceding employment, whichever is higher or (2) less than the minimum wage rate prescribed in section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

(b) Not later than sixty days after the close of the fiscal year 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter the Director shall prepare and submit to the President for submission to the Congress a list of the names of all officers or employees whose compensation is subject to the limitations set forth in subsection (a) of this section and who were receiving at the end of such fiscal year a salary of \$10,000 or more per year, together with the amount of compensation paid to each such person and the amount of such compensation paid from funds advanced or granted pursuant to this Act. No grant, contract or agreement shall be made under any of the provisions of this Act referred to in subsection (a) of this section which does not contain adequate provisions to assure the furnishing of information required by the preceding sentence.

(c) No person whose compensation exceeds \$6,000 per annum and is paid pursuant to any grant, contract, or agreement authorized under part A of title I or part A of title II (except a person compensated as provided in section 602) shall be employed at a rate of compensation which exceeds by more than 20 percent the salary which he was receiving in his immediately preceding employment, but the Director may grant exceptions for specific cases. In determining salary in preceding employment for one regularly employed for a period of less than 12 months per year, the salary shall be adjusted to an annual basis.

【PART B—COORDINATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS

【COORDINATION

【SEC. 611. (a) In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are carried out in a coordinated manner—

【(1) the Director is authorized to call upon other Federal agencies to supply such statistical data, program reports, and other materials as he deems necessary to discharge his responsibilities under this Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the antipoverty efforts of all Federal agencies;

【(2) Federal agencies which are engaged in administering programs related to the purposes of this Act, or which otherwise perform functions relating thereto, shall—

【(A) cooperate with the Director in carrying out his duties and responsibilities under this Act; and

【(B) carry out their programs and exercise their functions in such manner as will, to the maximum extent permitted by other applicable law, assist in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and

【(3) the President may direct that particular programs and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of the Federal agencies referred to in paragraph (2) shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support of programs authorized under this Act.

【(b) In order to insure that all existing Federal agencies are utilized to the maximum extent possible in carrying out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry out this Act shall be used to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

【(c) It shall be the responsibility of the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other departments and agencies concerned, acting through the President's Committee on Manpower, to provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all programs and activities within the executive branch of the Government relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability.

【(d) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate (which may include arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

【(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides and develops its capacity for providing maximum support for the programs described in subsection (c); and

[(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program, such employment information as will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained.]

[PREFERENCE TO COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS]

[SEC. 612. To the extent feasible and consistent with the provisions of law governing any Federal program and with the purposes of this Act, the head of each Federal agency administering any Federal program is directed to give preference to any application for assistance or benefits which is made pursuant to or in connection with a community action program approved pursuant to title II of this Act.]

JOINT FUNDING

SEC. 612. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to a community action agency or other agency assisted under this Act, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose.

[INFORMATION CENTER]

[SEC. 613. (a) In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are utilized to the maximum extent possible, and to insure that information concerning such programs and other relevant information is readily available in one place to public officials and other interested persons, the Director is authorized as he deems appropriate to collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute such information, either free of charge or by sale at cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's account as an offset to such cost), and make arrangements and pay for any printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulation.

[(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement. The Director is further authorized to make grants from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this Act, to States and communities to establish information service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribution of information required to further the purposes of this Act.]

[(c) In order to insure that all Federal programs related to the purposes of this Act are utilized to the maximum possible extent, and in order to insure that all appropriate officials are kept fully informed of such programs, the Director shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to States and local agencies of all current information, including administrative rules, regulations and guidelines, required by such agencies for the effective performance of their responsibilities.]

[PROHIBITION OF FEDERAL CONTROL]

[SEC. 614. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.]

DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 615. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

[TRANSFER OF FUNDS]

[SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appropriations under any title of this Act, or any Act authorizing appropriations for any such title (other than part C of title I), not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling the Director to carry out programs or activities under any such title may be transferred and used by the Director for the purpose of carrying out programs or activities under any other such title; but no such transfer shall result in increasing the amounts otherwise available under any title by more than 10 per centum.]

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appropriations for any program or activity under this Act or any Act authorizing appropriations for such program or activity, not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling the Director to carry out any such program or activity under the Act may be transferred and used by the Director for the purpose of carrying out any other such program or activity under the Act; but no such transfer shall result in increasing the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity by more than 10 per centum.

DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN AREAS

SEC. 617. The Director shall adopt appropriate administrative measures to assure that benefits of this Act will be distributed equitably between residents of rural and urban areas.

LIMITATION ON ADDITIONAL SUPER GRADES

SEC. 618. No additional positions above those authorized on the date of enactment of this section shall be created or filled in fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 in the classification categories of GS 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title 5, United States Code in the Office of Economic Opportunity and its field offices.

LIMITATION ON FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 619. The total administrative expenses, including the compensation of Federal employees, incurred by Federal agencies under the authority of this Act for any fiscal year shall not exceed ten percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for that year: *Provided, however, That grants, subsidies, and contributions, and payments to individuals, other than Federal employees shall not be counted as an administrative expense.*

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION

SEC. 620. The Director and the heads of any other Federal departments or agencies to which the conduct of programs described in this Act have been delegated shall take such steps as may be desirable and appropriate to insure that the resources of private enterprise are employed to the maximum feasible extent in the programs described in this Act. The Director and such other agency heads shall submit at least annually to the Congress a joint or combined report describing the actions taken and the progress made under this section.

PART B—COORDINATION

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 630. *This part establishes an Economic Opportunity Council, provides for an information center, and prescribes certain duties and responsibilities. Its purpose is to promote better coordination among all programs related to this Act, with a view to making those programs more effective in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State and local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to varying local problems and conditions, stimulating new and more imaginative ways of combining complementary Federal resources in the solution of specific problems, and generally improving cooperation and communication among all levels of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related to the purposes of this Act.*

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

SEC. 631. (a) *There is established, in the Executive Office of the President, the Economic Opportunity Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), which shall be composed of the Director and the heads of such Federal departments and agencies, such Presidential assistants and such other officials of the Federal Government as the President may from time to time designate. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council to serve as chairman. Each member shall designate an alternative to sit in his stead in the event of his unavoidable absence.*

(b) *It shall be the responsibility of the Council to assist the President in—*

(1) *providing for the coordination of Federal programs and activities related to this Act;*

(2) *developing basic policies and setting priorities with respect to such programs and activities;*

(3) resolving differences arising among Federal departments and agencies with respect to such programs and activities; and

(4) initiating and arranging for the carrying out of specific actions or projects designed to achieve the objectives of this Act.

(c) The President shall appoint an Executive Secretary of the Council. The Executive Secretary is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties. Employees of other Federal departments and agencies may be detailed to the Council from time to time to provide temporary assistance.

(d) To the extent appropriate, a report of the activities of the Council shall be included in the annual report of the Director to the President and to the Congress, or in a separate report to the Congress.

(e) From the sums authorized and appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title, the President shall reserve such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

SEC. 632. In addition to his other powers under this Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the antipoverty efforts of all Federal agencies, the Director shall—

(1) undertake special studies of specific coordination problems at the request of the President or the Council, or on his own initiative;

(2) carry on a continuing evaluation of all activities under this Act, and consult with interested agencies and groups, including State agencies described in section 231 of this Act and the National Advisory Council, with a view to identifying coordination problems that may warrant consideration by the Council or the President and, to the extent feasible or appropriate, initiate action for overcoming those problems either through the Office of Economic Opportunity or in conjunction with other Federal, State, or local agencies; and

(3) prepare a five-year national poverty action plan showing estimates of Federal and other governmental expenditures, and, where feasible, the contributions of the private sector, needed to eliminate poverty in this country within alternative periods of time. Such plan shall include estimates of the funds necessary to finance all relevant programs authorized by this and other Acts, and any new programs which may be necessary to eliminate poverty in this country, and it shall include recommendations for such new programs. The plan shall be presented to the Congress and updated on an annual basis.

COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

SEC. 633. (a) Federal agencies administering programs related to this Act shall—

(1) cooperate with the Director and with the Council in carrying out their duties and responsibilities; and

(2) carry out their programs and exercise their functions so as to assist in carrying out the provisions and purposes of this Act, to the fullest extent permitted by other applicable law.

(b) The Council and the Director may call upon Federal agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and other materials as they deem necessary to discharge their responsibilities under this Act.

(c) *The President may direct that particular programs and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of Federal agencies shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support of programs authorized under this Act.*

COMBINATIONS AMONG PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 634. *In order to encourage efficiencies, close unnecessary service gaps, and generally promote more effective administration, the Director shall require, to the fullest extent feasible, that projects or programs assisted under this Act be carried on so as to supplement one another, or where appropriate other related programs or projects, and be included within or otherwise carried on in combination with community action programs. In the case of other programs related to this Act, the heads of the Federal agencies responsible for those programs shall, to the extent permitted by law, similarly provide assistance for projects and activities in a manner which encourages combinations with other related projects and activities, where appropriate, and with community action programs. The Economic Opportunity Council shall, in carrying out its responsibilities under this part, make a continuing review of the operation of this section with a view to (1) determining particular groups of programs which, because of their objectives, or similarities in target groups or areas, are especially appropriate for combined or closely coordinated operation at the State or local level, and making recommendations accordingly to the President or appropriate Federal officials; (2) evaluating Federal agency procedures for carrying out this section, and developing or recommending additional or common procedures, as appropriate; and (3) determining whether, and to what extent, consolidations of Federal programs may be justified and making recommendations respecting such consolidations to the Director and the President.*

INFORMATION CENTER

SEC. 635. (a) *The Director shall establish and operate an information center for the purpose of insuring that maximum use is made of Federal programs related to this Act and that information concerning those programs and other relevant information is readily available to public officials and other interested persons. The Director shall collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute information as described above, either free of charge or by sale at cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's account as an offset of that cost), and may make arrangements and pay for any printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law or regulations. In connection with operation of the center, the Director may carry on research or studies concerning the improvement of information systems in support of the purposes of this Act, the adequacy of existing data, ways in which data generated on the State and local level may be incorporated into Federal information systems, and methods by which data may be made more readily available to State and local officials or used to further coordination objectives.*

(b) *The Director shall publish and maintain on a current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to individual and community improvement. He may also make grants, from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this Act, to States and communities to establish information service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribution of information required to further the purposes of this Act.*

(c) *In order to assure that all appropriate officials are kept fully informed of programs related to this Act, and that maximum use is made of those programs, the Director shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to State and local agencies of all current information, including administrative rules, regulations, and guidelines, required by those agencies for the effective performance of their responsibilities.*

PROHIBITION

SEC. 636. In order to assure that existing Federal agencies are used to the fullest extent possible in carrying out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry out this Act shall be used to establish any new department or office when the intended function is being performed by an existing department or office.

SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 637. (a) It shall be the responsibility of the Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other departments and agencies concerned, acting through such procedures or mechanisms as the President may prescribe, to provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and appropriate to implement the effective coordination of all programs and activities within the executive branch of the Government relating to the training of individuals for the purpose of improving or restoring employability.

(b) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agreements as may be necessary or appropriate (which may include arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-State employment service provides and develops its capacity for providing maximum support for the programs described in subsection (a); and

(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the head of any other Federal agency administering a training program, such employment information as will facilitate the placement of individuals being trained.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 638. As used in this part, "programs related to this Act" and "coordination" shall include the programs and actions described in this section:

(1) "Programs related to this Act" include programs under this Act and all Federal or federally assisted programs which have objectives which are, in whole or substantial part, complementary to the purposes of this Act, or which provide resources which may be used in combination with resources under this Act to assist in achieving any of the purposes of this Act.

(2) "Coordination" includes, but is not limited to—

(A) actions to improve the common effectiveness of programs in reaching and serving the poor, such as actions: to extend services to new areas, provide them in a common place, or structure them so that they are more readily accepted or widely utilized; to eliminate procedures or requirements that may be

inappropriate for or result in unnecessary hardship to disadvantaged persons with limited education or other special handicaps; to establish common eligibility standards among programs serving substantially similar groups or operating in the same areas; or to develop methods of operation or administration that will provide new employment incentives or opportunities for the poor;

(B) actions to promote better use at the State or local level of Federal assistance available under diverse programs, such as actions to establish procedures for cooperation among State or local agencies seeking assistance from different Federal sources with a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication and service gaps and promoting common or complementary priorities; or to modify or improve technical or administrative requirements imposed by different Federal agencies that may operate to increase unnecessarily the burdens of State or local agencies, minimize their opportunities for the imaginative use of Federal assistance, or discourage their cooperation with one another;

(C) actions to promote simplification and efficiencies through the joint or combined use of Federal resources, such as actions to develop new methods of processing requests for assistance or granting assistance that will enable Federal agencies more generally to use resources jointly in support of common objectives; to establish common priorities for purposes of program planning, research and demonstration activities; and to effect combinations among or redirect Federal programs or activities for the purpose of eliminating unnecessary duplication;

(D) actions to improve communication and general cooperation, such as actions to strengthen ties among regional offices of different Federal agencies and among such offices and other regional agencies or organizations; to develop and improve procedures by which Federal agencies may act together in promulgating or making available items of information, including information as to the availability and allocation of funds, which are closely related to one another for purposes of State or local planning and budgeting; or to develop procedures by which State and local agencies may be afforded new opportunities to participate in Federal policy decisions, including decisions on recommended legislation, affecting their capacity to operate efficiently and effectively.

【TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

【PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

【SEC. 701. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall provide that—

【(1) the first \$85 plus one-half of the excess over \$85 of payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under title I or II of this Act or any program assisted under such title shall not be regarded (A) as income or resources of such person

in determining his need under such approved State plan, or (B) as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan;

[(2) no payments made to or on behalf of any person for or with respect to any month under such title or any such program shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual in determining the need of such other individual under such approved State plan except to the extent made available to or for the benefit of such other individual; and

[(3) no grant made to any family under title III of this Act shall be regarded as income or resources of such family in determining the need of any member thereof under such approved State plan.

[(b) No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for any period before July 1, 1965, shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of subsection (a).]

TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to provide incentives to welfare recipients to participate in programs which are designed to enable them to become self-supporting, and to complete such programs and become self-supporting within a reasonable period of time.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 702, Notwithstandaing the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall include provisions consistent with the rules prescribed or under this title.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 703. For the purposes of this title—

(a) "Public assistance" shall mean any aid or assistance payable pursuant to a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

(b) "Trainee" shall mean (1) any person enrolled in any program under title I, II, of III-B of this Act or employed in any such program as a resident nonprofessional or in any other combined work-and-training capacity, (2) any participant in any program assisted under the Emergency Employment Act of 1967, or (3) any person who is in training to become a VISTA volunteer and who has been designated a volunteer trainee or intern.

(c) "Qualifying income" shall mean (1) any amount paid as wages under title I of this Act to a trainee in a program described in paragraph (1) of section 123(a) of this Act (relating to Neighborhood Youth Corps programs for youth attending school); (2) any amount paid under this Act or the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 as wages, training allowance, or stipend to any other trainee during his first eighteen months as such a trainee; and (3) the net income derived, during the first eighteen months

following initial receipt of assistance under title III-A of this Act, by any assisted family from the assisted farm or nonagricultural enterprise.

(d) "Poverty line" shall mean an amount of monthly income determined by the Director, representing an approximation of the minimum level of income which is necessary to support a family of given size so that it can live out of poverty.

ATTRIBUTION OF INCOME

SEC. 704. Unless otherwise provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, no payment made under this Act to or on behalf of any trainee or VISTA volunteer shall be regarded as income or resources of any other individual under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX except to the extent that the payment is made available to or used for the benefit of such other individual.

AMOUNT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 705. (a) The amount of public assistance payable for any month to any person having qualifying income shall be the higher of (1) the amount determined under the State plan without regard to this section, or (2) the amount determined under subsection (b).

(b) The amount of public assistance which is payable for any month to any person who receives qualifying income shall be computed, for purposes of this subsection, as follows:

(1) The amount of public assistance, excluding assistance for medical care, shall be computed under the State plan as if the qualifying income had not been received (and without any provision for expenses connected with earning the qualifying income).

(2) If the qualifying income, when added to other income of the recipient and the public assistance determined under clause (1), is insufficient to provide a total income in excess of the monthly poverty line, the public assistance payable (other than assistance for medical care) shall be the amount determined under clause (1).

(3) If the qualifying income, when added to other income of the recipient and the public assistance determined under clause (1), exceeds the monthly poverty line, the public assistance payable (other than assistance for medical care) shall be the amount determined under clause (1), reduced by a percentage of the excess. Such percentage shall be determined so that public assistance would be terminated if the qualifying income, when added to the other income of the recipient, exceeded the poverty line by 25 per centum or more: Provided, however, That such percentage shall in no event be larger than 66⅔ per centum.

(4) Assistance for medical care shall be provided in accordance with the State plan. In States where the plan provides that assistance for medical care depends upon eligibility for other public assistance, such eligibility shall be determined in accordance with this subsection.

(c) If more than one member of a family receives income, the income of all members of the family shall be aggregated in making the computations under subsections (b)(2) and (b)(3). The foregoing sentence shall not apply in cases in which its application would be inconsistent with section 704.

SAVINGS PROVISION

SEC. 706. If, at the time the rules prescribed in section 705 become effective in his State, a trainee's public assistance is being computed in accordance with the prior version of this title, it shall continue to be so computed until (1) his rights under the prior version expire, or (2) he completes his participation in the particular program in which he is a trainee, whichever occurs sooner. Thereafter, if he receives additional qualifying income, his public assistance shall be determined in accordance with section 705.

[TITLE VIII—VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

[STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

[SEC. 801. It is the purpose of this title to enable and encourage volunteers to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty, by living and working among deprived people of all ages in urban areas, rural communities, on Indian reservations, in migrant worker camps, and Job Corps camps and centers; to stimulate, develop and coordinate programs of volunteer training and service; and, through such programs, to encourage individuals from all walks of life to make a commitment to combating poverty in their home communities, both as volunteers and as members of the helping professions.

[AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH VISTA PROGRAM

[SEC. 802. (a) The Director is authorized to recruit, select, train, and—

[(1) upon request of State or local agencies or private nonprofit organizations, refer volunteers to perform duties in furtherance of programs combating poverty at a State or local level; and

[(2) in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local agencies involved, assign volunteers to work (A) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; (B) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and (C) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

[(b) The referral or assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine; but volunteers shall not be so referred or assigned to duties or work in any State, nor shall programs under section 805 be conducted in any State without the consent of the Governor.

[VOLUNTEER SUPPORT

[SEC. 803. The Director is authorized to provide to all volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and to volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) such stipend, not to exceed \$50 per month (or, in the case of volunteer leaders designated in accordance with standards prescribed by the Director, not to exceed \$75 per month), such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation (including travel to and from the place of training), supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, and health and dental care as the Director may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.

[APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

[SEC. 804. (a) Each volunteer under section 802 shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 104(d) of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, such volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

[(b) All volunteers during training pursuant to section 802(a) and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 106 (b), (c), and (d) of this Act except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2) (B) of section 106 (c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 of the General Schedule of section 5332, title 5, United States Code.

[(c) For the purposes of subchapter III, chapter 73 of title V of the United States Code, a volunteer under this title shall be deemed to be a person employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

[SPECIAL PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS

[SEC. 805. The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements with appropriate public or private nonprofit organizations for the conduct of, special programs in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Such programs shall be designed to encourage more effective or better coordinated use of volunteer services, including services of low-income persons, or to make opportunities for volunteer experience available, under proper supervision and for appropriate periods, to qualified persons who are unable to make long-term commitments or who are engaged in or preparing to enter work where such experience may be of special value and in the public interest. Individuals who serve or receive training in such programs shall not, by virtue of such service or training, be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those related to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits; except

that such individuals who receive their principal support or compensation with respect to such service or training directly from the Director or his agent for payment shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as volunteers assigned pursuant to section 802(a)(2) of this Act. Not to exceed 15 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

[DURATION OF PROGRAM

[SEC. 806. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.**]**

TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE PROGRAMS

VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer programs, together with other powers and responsibilities designed to assist in the development and coordination of volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups, including elderly and retired Americans to perform meaningful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or short-term programs in their home or nearby communities, and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant workers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions, and situations where the application of human talent and dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-advancement.

PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to work—

(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers and their families, or of residents of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in their construction or operation by Federal funds; and

(3) in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act.

(b) *The assignment of volunteers under this section shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions on political activities that appropriately recognize the special status of volunteers living among the persons or groups served by programs to which they have been assigned) as the Director may determine; but volunteers under this part shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor*

TERMS OF SERVICE

SEC. 811. (a) *Volunteers under this part shall be required to make a full-time personal commitment to combating poverty. To the extent practicable, this shall include a commitment to live among and at the economic level of the people served, and to remain available for service without regard to regular working hours, at all times during their term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.*

(b) *Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to training. The Director may, however allow persons who are unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than two months where he determines that this more limited service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.*

(c) *All volunteers under this part shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to that oath or affirmation.*

SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

SEC. 812. (a) *The Director may provide a stipend to volunteers under this part while they are in training and on assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance with standards prescribed by him, have been designated volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills. The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel (including travel to and from the place of training), and leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment, subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their needs.*

(b) *Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend, or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5 U.S.C. 5582).*

(c) *The Director may provide or arrange for educational and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience which they have derived from their training and service in the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty as members of the helping professions.*

*PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS**COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS*

SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs designed to expand opportunities for persons to participate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment under section 810, and their home or nearby communities, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical, or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are undertaken in connection with these programs. These projects may include, without limitation, activities designed (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to participate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2) to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional, or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for the development or betterment of urban and rural neighborhoods or areas having especially large concentrations or proportions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the competence necessary to take advantage of public and private resources which would not otherwise be available or used for those programs; and (3) to assist existing national and local agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical needs.

(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such other support or allowances as the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, are required because of unusual or special circumstances affecting the project.

(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any program or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act, shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the Director under this section in providing for or assisting in the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such person.

SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of providing volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal year may be used for programs under this section.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO HELP YOUNG ADULT CRIMINAL OFFENDERS

SEC. 822. (a) The Director is authorized to conduct, or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements for the conduct of demonstration projects in not more than four areas during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968,

and in not more than six areas during each of the two succeeding fiscal years, under which—

(1) volunteers under part A, and members of the Teacher Corps furnished pursuant to this section, provide criminal offenders aged sixteen through twenty-five with intensive education, training, and counseling for at least a six-month period prior to their release from confinement and for at least a six-month period thereafter;

(2) not more than one hundred such volunteers are employed pursuant to this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not more than one hundred and fifty such volunteers are so employed during each of the two succeeding fiscal years;

(3) the Commissioner of Education furnishes, on a reimbursable basis, for the purpose of this section, members of the Teacher Corps who have been recruited and trained by one or more institutions of higher education; and

(4) not more than forty such members are furnished pursuant to this section during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not more than sixty such members are so furnished during each of the two succeeding fiscal years.

(b) Members of the Teacher Corps enrolled for purposes of this section, who are not experienced teachers, shall be compensated at the rate of \$75 per week plus \$15 per week for each dependent. Such members who are experienced teachers shall be compensated at a rate to be fixed by the Commissioner of Education. Assignment of members of the Teacher Corps pursuant to this section shall be without regard to the provisions of section 513(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title with one another, with community action programs, and with other related Federal, State, local, and national programs. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible, actions to promote service by volunteers or former volunteers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in providing necessary support to programs under part B, and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State, local, and national agencies responsible for programs related to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging greater use of volunteer services in those programs and establishing in connection with them systematic procedures for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orientation or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant to this part.

PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall take necessary steps, including the development of special projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest participation of older persons as volunteers in the

various programs and activities authorized under this title and, because of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty group, shall encourage the development of a variety of volunteer services to older persons, including special projects, to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.

APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment.

(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, persons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116(a) (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in 116(a)(2)(B) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that service under this title is limited to activities which would not otherwise be performed and which will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for service.

(b) All support, including transportation provided to volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest possible cost consistent with the effective operations of volunteer programs.

(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such agency or organization.

DURATION OF PROGRAM

SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may authorize by law.

SECTION 203 OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962, AS AMENDED

TRAINING ALLOWANCES

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Labor may, on behalf of the United States, enter into agreements with States under which the Secretary of Labor shall make payments to such States either in advance or by way of reimbursement for the purpose of enabling such States, as agents for the United States, to make payment of weekly training allowances to unemployed persons selected for training pursuant to the provisions of section 202 and undergoing such training in a program operated pursuant to the provisions of the Act. Such payments

shall be made for a period not exceeding one hundred and four weeks, and the basic amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed \$10 more than the amount of the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available: *Provided*, That the basic amount of such payments may be increased by \$5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of four additional dependents: *Provided further*, That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of his total allowance, including payments for dependents, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess. With respect to Guam and the Virgin Islands the Secretary shall by regulation determine the amount of the training allowance to be paid any eligible person training under this Act.

With respect to any week for which a person receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the total training allowance, including payments for dependents, provided for by the preceding paragraph, a supplemental training allowance may be paid to a person eligible for a training allowance under this Act. The supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the training allowance provided by the preceding paragraph.

For persons undergoing on-the-job training, the amount of any payment which would otherwise be made by the Secretary of Labor under this section shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to that payment as the number of compensated hours per week under the training program bears to forty hours.

The training allowance of a person engaged in training under section 204 or 231 shall not be reduced on account of employment (other than employment under an on-the-job training program under section 204) which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked (other than in employment under such an on-the-job training program) in excess of twenty hours per week.

(b) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to pay to any person engaged in training under this title, including compensated, full-time on-the-job training, such sums as he may determine to be necessary to defray transportation expenses, and when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of the trainee's regular place of residence, subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of the trainee: *Provided*, That the Secretary in defraying such subsistence expenses shall not afford any individual an allowance exceeding \$35 per week, at the rate of \$5 per day; nor shall the Secretary authorize any transportation expenditure exceeding the rate of 10 cents per mile, except in the case of local transportation where he may authorize reimbursement for the trainee's travel by the most economical mode of public transportation, and except that in noncontiguous States and in areas outside the continental United States where the per diem allowance prescribed under section 836 of title 5, United

States Code, exceeds the maximum per diem allowance prescribed under that section for contiguous States, the Secretary may provide for a reasonable increase in the transportation and subsistence expenses in such amounts as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe.

(c) The Secretary of Labor shall pay training allowances only to unemployed persons who have had at least one year of experience in gainful employment: *Provided*, That he shall not pay training allowances to members of a family or a household in which the head of the family or the head of the household as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is employed, unless the Secretary determines that such payments are necessary in order for the trainees to undertake or to continue training: *Provided further*, That, no allowances shall be paid to any member of a family or household if the Secretary of Labor determines that the head of such family or household has terminated his employment for the purpose of qualifying such member for training allowances under this section. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary may pay training allowances [at a rate not in excess of \$20 a week] *at a rate which shall not exceed the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available*, to youths seventeen years of age or older who require such training allowance in order to undertake training, who are referred for training in accordance with section 202(b), and who are not entitled to allowances under the preceding sentence, except that no such training allowance shall be paid to any such youth who has not graduated from high school, unless the Secretary has satisfied himself that such youth has continuously failed to attend school for a period of not less than one year or that the local authorities after pursuing all appropriate procedures, including guidance and counseling, have concluded, after considering any assistance available under section 13 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, that further school attendance by such youth in any regular academic or vocational program is no longer practicable under the circumstances. The number of youths under the age of twenty-two who are receiving training allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation) shall, except for such adjustments as may be necessary for effective management of programs under this section, not exceed 25 per centum of all persons receiving such allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation). The Secretary of Labor may authorize continued payments of allowances to any youth who becomes twenty-two years of age during the course of his training, if he has completed a substantial part of such training. Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in this subsection or in subsection (h), the Secretary may refer any individual who has completed a program under part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to training under this Act, and such individual may be paid a training allowance as provided in section 203(a) of this Act without regard to the requirements imposed on such payments by the preceding sentences of subsection (c) or by subsection (h) of this section. Such payments shall not exceed the average

weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available. Such persons shall not be deemed youths for the purpose of applying the provision under this subsection limiting the number of youths who may receive training allowances.

(d) No training allowance shall be made to any person otherwise eligible who, with respect to the week for which such payment would be made, has received or is seeking unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law, but if the appropriate State or Federal agency finally determines that a person denied training allowances for any week because of this subsection was not entitled to unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or such Federal or State law with respect to such week, this subsection shall not apply with respect to such week.

(e) A person who refuses, without good cause, to accept training under this Act shall not, for one year thereafter, be entitled to training allowances.

(f) Any agreement under this section may contain such provisions (including, as far as may be appropriate, provisions authorized or made applicable with respect to agreements concluded by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to title XV of the Social Security Act) as will promote effective administration, protect the United States against loss and insure the proper application of payments made to the State under such agreement. Except as may be provided in such agreements, or in regulations hereinafter authorized, determinations by any duly designated officer or agency as to the eligibility of persons for weekly training allowances under this section shall be final and conclusive for any purposes and not subject to review by any court or any other officer.

(g) (1) If State unemployment compensation payments are paid to a person taking training under this Act and eligible for a training allowance, the State making such payments shall be reimbursed from funds herein appropriated. The amount of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished to him by the States and such amount shall then be placed in the State's unemployment trust fund account.

(2) If employment benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act are paid to a person taking training under this Act and eligible for a training allowance, the railroad unemployment insurance account in the unemployment trust fund shall be reimbursed, from funds herein appropriated, for all of such benefits paid. The amount of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor on the basis of reports furnished to him by the Railroad Retirement Board and such amount shall then be placed in the railroad unemployment insurance account.

(h) A person who, in connection with an occupational training program, has received a training allowance or whose unemployment compensation payments were reimbursed under the provisions of this Act or any other Federal Act shall not be entitled to training allowances under this Act for one year after the completion or other termi-

nation (for other than good cause) of the training with respect to which such allowance or payment was made unless the Secretary determines that there is good cause to permit an individual referred to further training to receive training allowances so that he may be prepared adequately for full-time employment.

(i) No training allowance shall be paid to any person who is receiving training for an occupation which requires a training period of less than six days.

(j) To assure the maximum use of training opportunities, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to make, or cause to be made, advance payments of training allowances or a part thereof to individuals selected for training who, because of immediate financial needs for the maintenance of themselves or their dependents pending receipt of training allowances, would otherwise be unable to enter or continue training. The total advance payments to a trainee under this subsection outstanding at any time shall not exceed the amount of the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available most immediately prior to the commencement of training by such trainee. Such advance payments shall be repaid either through deductions from training allowances or through other arrangements with such trainee.

(k) Under such standards as the Secretary of Labor may find appropriate to achieve the purposes of subsection 202(l), an individual referred to part-time training under such section shall be paid an amount not to exceed \$10 with respect to each week in which he is engaged in such training and such payment shall be in lieu of any other payments to which he may otherwise be entitled under this section.

(l)(1) No training allowance shall be paid to any person for any period for which a money payment has been made with respect to the need of that person under a State plan which has been approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act and which meets the requirements of the first sentence of paragraph (2) of this subsection. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to pay to any such person (A) such sums as the Secretary determines to be necessary to defray expenses of that person which are attributable to training pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and (B) a training incentive payment of not more than \$20 per week. Persons receiving payments under the preceding sentence shall be counted for purposes of the third sentence of section 203(c) as though they were receiving training allowances.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, a State plan approved under any such title shall provide that no payment made to any person pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be regarded (A) as income or resources of that person in determining his need under such approved State plan, or (B) as income or resources of any other person in determining the need of that other person under such approved State plan. No funds to which a State is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for any period before the first month beginning after the adjournment of the State's first regular legislative session which adjourns more than sixty days after

the enactment of this subsection shall be withheld by reason of any action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents such State from complying with the requirements of this paragraph.

SECTION 105 OF TITLE 3, UNITED STATES CODE

COMPENSATION OF SECRETARIES AND EXECUTIVE, ADMINISTRATIVE AND STAFF ASSISTANTS TO THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 105. The President is authorized to fix the compensation of six administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, of the Executive Secretary of the Nation Aeronautics and Space Council, of the *Executive Secretary of the Economic Opportunity Council*, and of eight other secretaries or immediate staff assistants in the White House Office at rates of basic compensation not to exceed that of level II of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule.

MINORITY VIEWS

It goes without saying that we heartily subscribe to the purposes of the Economic Opportunity Act; there is no doubt that a great national effort involving all sectors of American life and all levels of government is needed to eradicate poverty, end urban blight, and revitalize the Nation's depressed rural areas.

A great many of the program ideas underlying the war on poverty also merit our strong support. For example, the community action program is close to the heart of much of Republican philosophy in its emphasis upon self-help and local determination of local needs and program approaches.

What is distressing and genuinely disturbing to those who hope for a victory in the war on poverty is the continuing mismanagement of the program at both the Federal and the local levels. Most of these problems are in the area of implementation and cannot be cured by legislative fiat. Perhaps a hardheaded congressional investigation specifically aimed at these problem areas and solutions to them could, by the force of embarrassment and persuasion, produce some of the needed changes. We regret that the subcommittee's lengthy investigation did not have this as one of its focuses. Some of the most disturbing of these problems are discussed below in the hope that the OEO will itself strive voluntarily to correct them and obviate the need for more strict legislative prescriptions.

First, we believe that in a great many cases the community action program is not mobilizing the whole spectrum of community resources in the attack on poverty. In large part, this is because the OEO has not actively enforced its own guidelines concerning broad community representation on boards of directors and in the planning activities of the community action agencies. In some cases, including cases where important political pressures are present, the agency has allowed a city administration to capture the community action agency in a way which effectively excludes any significant participation of the poor. In other cases, the agency has not intervened where the pendulum has swung too far in the direction of control by self-appointed representatives of the poor, with the result that private social welfare agencies, the business community, and public officials have been shut out. Striking a proper balance between these two poles will become even more important under the committee's bill where all title I-B and title II funds are to be channeled through the CAA's. This situation calls for a more active policy by the OEO in maintaining a broad community base for its programs, and a willingness to bypass the community action agency in favor of independent neighborhood groups or local public agencies where the CAA has not adequately included such elements in its program. Duly elected public officials, who are held responsible for the failures of the program by the public, must be intimately involved at the local level in the planning and conduct of projects.

There is also much doubt that the requirements of one-third representation of the poor on CAA boards and attendant "democratic selection" procedures are working properly. We hope that the OEO will experiment in the future with a variety of forms of client participation, ranging from full-fledged elections to an advisory council approach, and will make specific findings and recommendations to the Congress on this subject.

Beyond the fact of frequent imbalance on CAA boards, there has been a discouraging lack of emphasis by the OEO on building up technical competence within the local agency staffs. Local initiative and self-help are effective only where the community group can combine knowledge of local conditions with a broad understanding of the variety of governmental programs and different programmatic approaches. A great deal remains to be done to train community action agency staffs and to communicate the lessons of experience from one program to another. Local groups cannot be allowed to ignore the need for expert advice and management direction simply because this help would come from outside the community.

The Job Corps remains a problem. There is substantial doubt that OEO's chosen method of implementing this part of the legislation—establishing very large urban training centers which tend to be located far from an enrollee's home—is the best approach to residential vocational training. The agency has been reluctant, once embarked upon this path, to experiment with other approaches, including combined residential and nonresidential facilities, smaller centers located closer to enrollees' homes, centers located in or near ghetto areas, and centers which are run in conjunction with similar activities under the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1963. As a result of a Republican initiative, the demonstration provisions under the Job Corps now require broad experimentation with such alternative approaches and we expect from the agency adequate comparative data in the near future.

Administrators of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program in the Department of Labor have continued to give inadequate attention to the education and training aspects of that program and to the development of jobs which have some occupational future other than make-work. Particularly disturbing has been the only token compliance with the amendments of last year which authorize on-the-job training for NYC enrollees. We heartily subscribe to the new mandatory language in the committee bill, which was the result of a Republican initiative, which requires basic education and training components in every NYC program.

We are gratified that a number of suggestions by the minority have been included in this bill, and we wish to explain them briefly.

(1) A number of minority amendments to the Job Corps were accepted by the committee. At the initiative of Senator Murphy, the provisions of section 105(a) were amended to provide for a professional finding on a case-by-case basis before a youth with a history of serious delinquent behavior can be included in the Job Corps. Also at Senator Murphy's urging, section 113(b) was amended specifically to authorize the OEO to carry out pilot projects involving seriously delinquent youth, since it was clear from the record that the agency itself felt that it should and would not attempt to serve this segment of the population.

An amendment by Senator Javits adding subsection 104(c) requiring more adequate enrollment from rural areas was accepted by the committee, as was his amendment adding subsection 107(b) requiring that, where feasible, centers would offer training on a nonresidential basis to enrollees in programs authorized under part B of title I, including the Neighborhood Youth Corps. Amendments initiated by Senator Prouty to section 109 provide for graduation of both the personal allowance and that part of the readjustment allowance which is not paid to dependents, so as to encourage longer enrollments in the program. Senator Prouty's detailed amendments to section 112 were accepted, requiring better followup and placement procedures including an expanded role for the U.S. Employment Service in placement and postenrollment evaluation. Amendments offered by Senator Javits to section 113(a) were included to require cost-benefit analyses of different program approaches to residential training, including comparisons with proper control groups.

The committee accepted Senator Murphy's proposal to require the Director, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, to enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to establish combined vocational schools and skill centers in urban areas.

(2) In title I-B, Senator Javits' amendment establishing a new program of incentives to private employers to encourage them to hire and train the hard-core poor was accepted. Under this program, a variety of incentives tailored on a case-by-case basis would be offered to employers, including reimbursements for costs of added recruiters, counselors, transportation, and losses incurred as a result of the lower productivity of such workers. Senator Javits also sponsored amendments to section 127, requiring the agency to engage in pilot programs to encourage maximum private industry involvement in work and training programs, and to section 132, requiring the development of comparative data about training programs and for the use of proper control groups in program evaluations.

(3) Senator Javits, with Senator Kennedy of New York, sponsored a major revision of title I-D, which establishes the special impact program. The primary changes involved were (a) the inclusion of rural areas having substantial outmigration as eligible for assistance under the program, (b) the delineation of certain economic and business development functions, to be delegated to the Department of Commerce, and (c) the application of resources under other programs, including urban renewal and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

(4) In title II Senators Javits and Murphy jointly sponsored amendments to sections 202(a)(6) and 221(a)(4) to authorize OEO to provide programs of prevention and rehabilitation for narcotics addicts and alcoholics. Senator Javits also introduced amendments to section 232, requiring pilot projects in the areas of narcotics addiction prevention and private enterprise participation in community action programs, and to section 233, requiring the use of proper control groups in evaluation procedures.

(5) Senator Javits sponsored a new small business assistance program under title IV which is to be administered by the Department of Commerce and the content of that program is described in the foregoing report of the committee.

(6) A new part B of title V was added as the result of amendments offered by Senator Javits with Senator Prouty, establishing a day care program designed to encourage low-income parents to accept work and training opportunities. Senator Griffin initiated amendments to the program as it was originally offered which specify that where children from other than a low-income family are participants, the family shall be required to make appropriate payments of all or part of the costs.

(7) An amendment by Senator Javits added subsection 604(1) requiring a timely and expeditious appeal to the Director for groups whose application for delegate agency status is denied by a community action agency. Senator Javits also introduced an amendment to section 632 requiring the agency to prepare a 5-year national poverty action plan showing estimates of governmental spending needed to eliminate poverty in the United States within various periods of program duration. We understand that the agency has such estimates in hand but has denied the Congress access to them.

(8) On Senator Prouty's motion, an amendment to section 203 of the Manpower Development and Training Act was added to allow the Department of Labor to pay allowances to youths under that program which are equivalent to those paid to enrollees in on-the-job training under the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

JACOB K. JAVITS.
WINSTON L. PROUTY.
PETER H. DOMINICK.
GEORGE MURPHY.
PAUL J. FANNIN.
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MR. PROUTY

In January 1964, President Johnson requested the Congress to enact a program designed, in his words, to eradicate poverty in America. Three years ago, a bipartisan Congress enacted that program, known as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, thereby reaffirming the people's continued adherence to the American dream—that the poor who have the potential to do so should have the chance to earn and learn their way out of poverty.

Two years ago, rumblings were arising from the grassroots of America, and the implementation of the war on poverty became a subject of national debate—a controversial debate which has not as yet ended. The objectives of the poverty program were questioned by few, as its fundamental principles are deeply engrained as part of our American heritage. Rather, the issues that divided our people then, as now, centered around the means and the methods employed to transform these great principles into affirmative and meaningful action.

In retrospect, it is obvious that the 1964 poverty program was primarily a political vehicle, slapped together out of paste and paper without much study of the problems and with little or no analysis of such basic issues as determining (1) the primary causes of poverty, (2) which of these causes were capable of being remedied by actions of the Federal Government, (3) how the Government should intervene in those areas where its actions could be beneficial, and—very importantly—(4) what alternative courses of action were available for attacking the root causes of poverty.

In both 1965 and 1966, Congress, with much reluctance and many misgivings, gave OEO the benefit of the doubt and extended its life, hopeful that the future of the war on poverty would see more efficient administration, produce more tangible results, and reveal less political gamesmanship.

Now, in 1967, we are faced with the same ultimate question: Has the war on poverty been a success?

I think it is clear that most of the goals sought to be attained have been accepted by the people. Nevertheless, criticism by rank-and-file citizens has generally increased with respect to the administration of many of these programs. Thus, while a vast majority of Americans agree that the objectives of the poverty program are laudable and commendable, there is a growing feeling of skepticism as to the integrity of administration and a general conclusion that political influence is increasing rather than decreasing in these programs.

Also, as demonstrated by events of this past summer, there is more and more bitterness developing among those whom these programs were designed to reach and whose expectations have been raised with hope of a better life only to be bitterly disillusioned. In my individual views to the 1965 Economic Opportunity Act Amendments, because of my conviction that this beneficial type of legislation was already honeycombed with political maneuvering which would be a deterrent

to its actually benefiting the underprivileged, I predicted such a result when the rank-and-file citizen eventually became aware of the "performance gap" between the predictions and the results of the war on poverty.

Needless to say, I regret that events have proved my prediction correct.

No one with any awareness of the problems of the poor and the impact of these problems upon the national welfare could, in good conscience, reject the stated aims of the so-called war on poverty. However, the means employed toward the attainment of such objectives must be subjected to constant and searching analysis. Obviously, without such careful scrutiny, many millions of dollars may be wasted, and, even more tragically, the ultimate ends we are seeking and searching for may remain unfulfilled.

In August 1964, when the original Economic Opportunity Act was under consideration by the Senate, the Wall Street Journal ran an editorial entitled "The Trees and the Forest." In discussing the manner in which the poverty program had been conceived, this editorial pointed out that the Government's first approach had better be the right one, in view of past practice indicating a refusal or inability by bureaucrats to admit error, and deploring the fact that the poverty program was being offered without searching questions being raised and answered in many important areas. Tragically, the last few paragraphs of this editorial seem to be as much in point today as they were 3 years ago, and I quote them here for the benefit of my colleagues

Past programs have suffered from similar lack of analysis. As a result, we've had urban renewal which enriched real estate developers without helping slum residents. We've had job retraining programs which took little notice of what jobs are available.

The problem has been that once programs are started, the administering agencies are loath to admit their methods are in error. The Government, it has been truly said, never knows when to stop or change course. New approaches are difficult if not impossible; the first approach had better be the right one.

It would be easier to keep such practicalities in mind if we didn't have to debate what role the Government should assume. But that debate is important and will go on. In the midst of it, however, advocates of limited Government would do well to supply a lot more constructive criticism of the type Senator Prouty offers.

On their part, proponents of increased Federal activity must stop writing off the criticism that their proposals won't work as merely part of what they consider a weary and abstract debate about the responsibilities Government should assume. They have the primary obligation, after all, to make sure their own proposals are not only well meant but workable.

To assume this responsibility, the supporters of the poverty war or any other Government welfare program need to recognize the joker in the idea of "commitment"—that Federal legislation involves not only commitment to a forest of principle, but also to the trees of particular methods.

In my letter to the President last year, which was printed as part of my individual views to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966, I stated:

Some functions of the war on poverty are useful and constructive, but others are ill-conceived or poorly administered or carry cost factors which cannot be justified.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the program should be reviewed in its entirety and in much greater detail than was possible this year.

In his supplemental views filed to the same report, the junior Senator from Rhode Island made the following comment:

Because I am concerned about the growth of bureaucracy in administering the program, the so far limited results, and the serious question of whether the people who most need the help are truly getting it, I strongly recommend that there should be a study in depth by a disinterested, clearly objective organization on the administration of the entire program in order to increase its efficiency and effectiveness in attaining our objectives. I believe there should also be an in-depth legislative investigation of the whole program early in this coming Congress, and, thereafter, close and continuing legislative security.

Early this year, our subcommittee decided to conduct an investigation—which the majority members preferred to call a study—of the manner in which the war on poverty programs have actually been implemented. My minority colleagues and I, together with the junior Senator from Rhode Island, argued in vain in an attempt to convince the majority members of our committee that such an investigation should be conducted by private management consultant firms as far as practicable, completely independent of control by the subcommittee or its staff. In our view it was imperative that the investigation of the war on poverty should be conducted by wholly disinterested persons on a basis that would be accepted as completely objective by the American people if the results of such investigation were to be accepted as an unbiased and honest evaluation. Unfortunately, a majority of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle rejected this approach, apparently believing that if the investigation was not controlled by the subcommittee, an attempt would be made to destroy rather than strengthen the poverty program.

As they often have in other areas, they completely rejected the idea that the rank and file citizen might be suspicious and somewhat distrustful of the results of a controlled investigation.

The poverty investigation, therefore, has been conducted with a special study group and through subcommittee contracts with various consultants. I have looked into studies submitted by three consultants and have found them to be either factually inaccurate or based upon information supplied by interested parties which was never checked to determine its validity.

I shall have more to say on this subject on the floor of the Senate, but these inaccuracies put the credibility of all the consultants' field reports in issue and raise certain substantial questions as to the reliability of the committee's conclusions and recommendations based on these studies.

During the course of the subcommittee's "investigation," hearings were held throughout the country, from California to New York and from Mississippi to Wisconsin. I was convinced then that this type of hearing would accomplish little. More than 6 months and \$165,000 later, at a time when an additional \$20,000 has been authorized to continue the investigation for the balance of this year, I regret to say that my fears have been fully justified.

I think it is apparent to any thinking person that without sufficient staff preparation, little can be learned of the administration of particular programs in the course of a 1- or 2-day hearing in a distant city. Such hearings, consisting of listening to selected witnesses screened by local poverty groups and a brief tour of predetermined sites announced to the press as an on-the-spot inspection of poverty programs picked at random, can contribute little to any real understanding of how efficiently the war on poverty is being administered or to what extent concrete results have been forthcoming.

How jaunting off to Providence or Boston or any other American city where 70 or 80 or more witnesses testify in 1 or 2 days can give subcommittee members who are present any real insight in the workings of the poverty program is beyond my understanding.

The bill which accompanies this report is apparently the result of this investigation. It has been so drastically altered by its sponsors, however, that it no longer resembles the bill introduced by the administration. The masses of materials and reports assembled in this investigation and still flowing into the offices of committee members in dribbles and drabs could not possibly as yet have been digested sufficiently to justify such significant changes at this early date.

Professor Sar A. Levitan has recently stated:

Once again we are faced with a hodgepodge of existing and proposed programs thrown together with relatively little factual information on which to evaluate the need and necessity for their implementation or for the establishment of priorities.

The most frustrating part of this year's poverty investigation to me has been the inability to elicit specific facts relating to the day-to-day administration and accomplishments of particular programs. Witness after witness, after testifying in glowing terms of the benefits being derived by the poverty-stricken under particular programs, became hesitant and evasive when asked for factual information as though a request for such data was designed to undermine rather than improve these programs. For those of us who are genuinely concerned with the poverty program in terms of providing a better life for all Americans, it is essential that a full disclosure of facts be made to permit us to tell what programs should be continued or modified; which should be terminated and what new programs are desirable to obtain the desired results.

For example, the first and guiding principle which must be met is to determine the impact of each of these programs in providing economic security for a poor person and his family. We must ask ourselves, "To what extent are the needs of the poor being met?" The value of any program can only be demonstrated by the contribution it makes to the employability and income of individual participants. Our investigation has not provided the full answers to this question. We have got to know the facts about where we have been

if we are to understand where we are now and what must still be done to take us where we want to go in the future. I cannot comprehend how Congress can be asked to legislate intelligently concerning this multibillion-dollar program if the facts surrounding its implementation and its prior results are withheld from us.

In view of the type of investigation which our subcommittee has conducted this year and the fact that this investigation has still not been completed, our committee might better have served the interests of the poor if it had concentrated on in-depth and constructive consideration of the results of its investigation in order to properly prepare proposed legislation for the next session of Congress. This it has failed to do and the bill which it is now reporting is primarily significant for the amounts of new money it includes for expansion in Federal employment.

When the Office of Economic Opportunity came into existence, I regarded its specific purpose as being to give skills to the unskilled, primarily our young people, with as much emphasis as possible to members of families whose income was below the poverty level. Originally the Office of Economic Opportunity placed no emphasis on reaching our older citizens although this policy has been somewhat changed within the last year or so.

It is a well-known fact that there are at least as many jobs available as there are unemployed individuals in the United States. For example, there are more than 11,000 job vacancies which went unfilled in the District of Columbia during the past year. Without any investigation at all, to the extent that jobs can accomplish the elimination of poverty, it can be seen that total employment may be achieved simply by training the unemployed in the skills required for those jobs in which there are vacancies. The primary emphasis of these training programs, of course, properly should be directed to our younger men and women. One of our basic problems today is not simply "making work"—rather, we must give meaningful employment to the unemployed by training them for existing and productive jobs.

Any real solution to the elimination or reduction of poverty must include massive job training for meaningful employment. Because of this fact, I am deeply disturbed by the problems which continue to plague the various training programs. There is still too much duplication, too much training for nonexistent jobs or for jobs where there is already an oversupply of labor available, and too much overlapping of similar programs administered by a variety of Government and nongovernmental agencies. If anything at all is clear from even a cursory investigation of the war on poverty, it is the marvelously complex duplication in the various training programs.

The Federal Government alone administers 79 separate training and education programs under the auspices of 15 different bureaus and agencies. For instance, the Upjohn Institute reports in a study that funds for job recruiting can be obtained from nine manpower program sources, funds for adult basic education from 10 sources (in addition to general education sources), funds for prevocational training and skilled training from 10 sources, and funds for work experience programs from five sources. It also points out that on-the-job training can be subsidized by five programs, supportive services can be funded from nine sources, and income maintenance is available to participants under nine programs. The eligibility rules, application procedures,

allocation formulas, expiration dates, and contracting arrangements vary as widely as the funding sources.

I believe it is safe to conclude that the results of these training programs have fallen very short of what Congress envisioned in enacting and continuing this legislation. The Job Corps has not provided adequate training and top officials of the Labor Department have admitted that the Neighborhood Youth Corps has engaged in "make work" programs rather than in training for jobs which will be available to our young people once they complete the training program.

Our subcommittee would have conducted a productive and worthwhile investigation if they had done nothing else this year but attempt to identify and eliminate the areas of duplication in these programs.

Last year I had an amendment adopted which established the National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity. This Council was given carte blanche to investigate OEO on an independent basis, and it was instructed to submit its conclusions and recommendations to the President by March 31, 1967, for transmission to the Congress with the President's recommendations.

As last year's amendments were not passed until late in the session, perhaps it was expecting too much to have the Council's first report submitted by March 31, 1967. However, when our full committee marked up this bill in August, the report was still not available and is not available now to the best of my knowledge. I point this out merely to illustrate again how we are being asked to legislate in this area without the benefit of sufficient facts and expert opinion.

When we speak of meaningful job training, we must, of course, include remedial education and other education courses. In view of duplication, fragmentation, and administrative overlap, I am convinced that we must eventually limit these training programs to specific areas of responsibility in the Department of Labor and the Office of Education, with Welfare being responsible for providing the required supportive services. The only alternative which appears feasible is to seriously consider the establishment of a Department of Education and Training which would coordinate all these programs under one Secretary at the Cabinet level.

While I do not suggest that education and training are panaceas for the solutions of the problems of the poor, they are the programs upon which the Federal Government should place most emphasis in playing its role in the war. It is all very well for us to finance freedom schools, airplane rides, and weekends at resort hotels for the poor. But none of them receive any benefit from such stunts except perhaps a momentary sense of exhilaration which only intensifies their sad plight when they return to their jobless homes. While we must raise the poor from poverty, we must also protect them from the cruelty of the good intentions of those who mean well but who are too often overwhelmed by the flicker of a smile.

Finally, it must be noted that this bill contains a new title II which authorizes the expenditure of \$2,800 million; more funds than is requested in the entirety for existing programs.

This measure was originally introduced as a separate bill by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. It was referred to our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but at no time were any hearings scheduled or conducted on it.

Furthermore, no hearings were ever held on this proposal by the Employment, Manpower and Poverty Subcommittee either before

or after this bill was offered as an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, despite the fact that the "make work" jobs to be provided under this provision have an impact on every training program presently in existence or authorized by the current poverty amendments. The absence of hearings has also precluded our committee from considering testimony which might have supported adopting an alternative course of action to achieve the same objective.

I believe it is now common knowledge that the White House circulated a secret memorandum which, among other things, called for the elimination of title II from the pending bill.

I might add that if Congress desires to implement a new program designed to create meaningful jobs, it would do well to consider the Human Investment Act which I introduced and which has been sponsored by a substantial number of my Senate colleagues and which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by over 100 Republicans. The tax credit provided in this bill could result in over \$20 billion worth of job training for a cost to the Government of roughly \$2 billion. Moreover, the training under this proposal would result in the creation of meaningful jobs where the individuals who participated would be able to progress up the ladder to better jobs as time went by.

What we really need is a valid partnership between the Federal Government and the private sector of our economy, including private enterprise, labor unions, and voluntary associations, which would be provided under my bill. Time is running out on how far we can go with "make work" programs. Jobs rather than doles must be provided to make the war on poverty truly effective.

In conclusion, I cannot overemphasize my desire to see the war on poverty won. To do this, however, we must not only have efficient administration of programs, but we must also have programs capable of achieving our real objectives. To the extent that the poverty program is turned into a political football, it will neither supply the wants and needs of our underprivileged and poverty-stricken nor become accepted by the masses of middle-class Americans whose support is vital for its success.

I shall continue to do all in my power to make this complex program more understandable, both to the Congress which must legislate upon it, and the people who must prove it workable. Once these programs have made truly constructive rather than political, thereby restoring the confidence of an overwhelming majority of American citizens in the war on poverty, I shall gladly support the commitment of much greater funds to the implementation of these programs.

WINSTON PROUTY.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MESSRS. DOMINICK AND FANNIN

While we endorse, in principle, the individual views of Senator Griffin, we feel constrained to add these additional comments.

We would like to emphasize our opposition to Title II: the Emergency Employment Act of 1967, in its present form. This amendment to the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 authorizes an additional \$2.8 billion over a 2-year period.

This amendment is not supported by hearings; in fact, none were held. To justify the amendment, the subcommittee staff prepared a pamphlet entitled "Emergency Employment Act—Background Information." The pamphlet provides a conglomeration of miscellaneous information ranging from public opinion polls to sundry reports and articles. If generously interpreted, this pamphlet may provide the background to support the argument for some legislation but it falls far short of providing a basis for this legislation. Subsequent to the time the bill was ordered reported, another staff pamphlet was prepared entitled "Emergency Employment Act—Summary, Questions, and Answers." This pamphlet also falls far short as an adequate substitute for a hearing record.

While the altruistic intentions of the Emergency Employment Act are clear, the legislative language leaves the reader in a fog of vague concepts. The act essentially commands the Secretary of Labor to "create" or "make" jobs, with only the most minimal legislative guidelines. Congress clearly has the responsibility to form its laws with precision. The Emergency Employment Act abdicates that responsibility and delegates the legislative authority to the Secretary of Labor.

We are clearly confronted with severe problems of unemployment in both our rural and urban areas. The riots in our cities have focused attention on our urban problems and have made it equally clear that a solution to these problems must be found. But it would seem to us that a response to these problems should be a studied response; a response based on hearings and carefully drafted legislation.

In fact, unemployment represents only one of the problems confronting our urban and rural areas. Despite the multifaceted aspects of these problems, this entire new program is directed to a single aspect—unemployment.

We are equally concerned about the authorizations as contained in title I of the bill, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. These amendments contain a 2-year authorization with specific sums totaling \$2.258 billion for fiscal year 1968 "with an open-ended" authorization for fiscal year 1969. This open-ended authorization for 1969 seems most inappropriate. The committee is asking the Senate for a 2-year commitment to the program without offering any guidelines as to what the second year commitment will entail. An open-ended authorization on any program is, as a matter of principle, a question-

able practice. This would seem especially true when authorizing funds for a program of this magnitude.

We also feel very strongly that Headstart should be transferred to the Office of Education. A great deal of credit should be given to the Office of Economic Opportunity for innovative ideas which have helped make Headstart a success. However, we have now reached the point where experience has demonstrated that better coordination is necessary between Headstart and the elementary schools. There is substantial evidence available which indicates that many of the gains achieved in Headstart are lost because the schools are not adequately geared to "follow through" or reinforce these gains.

However in our judgment, it is much wiser to involve the Office of Education at the administrative level in Headstart rather than involve the Office of Economic Opportunity in our school systems as is contemplated in the present bill. The Follow Through program as contained in the bill offers a clear recognition that more coordination is needed between the schools and Headstart. Unfortunately, the Follow Through concept, as contained in the bill, represents, in our judgment, a step in the wrong direction. Rather than bring the Office of Economic Opportunity into the schools, we believe it more advisable to place the administrative functions of Headstart in the Office of Education.

We also are concerned that the committee failed to accept a Republican amendment to specifically earmark \$352 million of the authorized appropriations for Headstart. Last year funds were specifically earmarked for this program. This year the committee threw Headstart back into the hopper to compete with all other community action program proposals for the Office of Economic Opportunity's administrative favor. Headstart is a very popular program and has gained wide public acceptance. We feel that the Congress has an obligation to the public to insure that this program will not be lost in a bureaucratic shuffle. Therefore, we urge that the Senate earmark funds for this program.

In conclusion, we are extremely concerned about the authorizations contained in this bill. Title I of the bill, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, contains a first-year authorization of \$2.258 billion and an "open ended" second-year authorization without the slightest indication of its eventual cost. Title II, the Emergency Employment Act, contains a 2-year authorization totaling \$2.8 billion. This title represents over one-half of this \$5 billion package and was reported to the floor without hearings. We are asked to support this \$5 billion bill at a time when we are facing a deficit of nearly \$30 billion, and at a time when the administration has asked for a significant tax increase. We must begin to exercise some measure of fiscal responsibility; it would seem appropriate to begin with this bill.

PETER H. DOMINICK.
PAUL FANNIN.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MR. MURPHY

I would like to state at the outset that I do now and have always supported the stated principles and purposes of the Office of Economic Opportunity. However, I now find myself greatly concerned once again by what seem to be administrative deficiencies and a lack of advanced planning, which indicate that this program, after 3 years, is still in the planning stages and has attempted to move too fast and too far in too many areas. The result is that much of the program has not been fairly or properly road tested.

Some of the program has worked out well, but in many instances more problems have been created than seem necessary. In the overall picture, I still feel that the tremendous cost, by all yardsticks of cost-effectiveness, has not been justified by the actual achievements.

In addition, after 3 years, I am still uncertain as to the definite function of OEO—whether it is to be an entirely new department to compete with already existing departments, whether it is to be simply an innovator of new programs to help the poor, whether it is to be a sort of coordinator, or whether the Director of OEO is to oversee and supersede the secretaries of other existing departments which have been concerned with solving the problems of the underprivileged, unemployed, uneducated, and unhealthy for many years.

I am also concerned that, as in the past, the committee seems to have difficulty in getting accurate and precise performance and planning information although this situation has improved somewhat during the last year.

I have several major objections to portions of this legislation. The first has to do with the future of the Job Corps. It is my feeling that the Job Corps should properly be administered by either the Department of Labor or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Both Departments are involved and I would suggest that the one assuming the supervision should eliminate all overlapping and duplicating of activities, thereby avoiding needless expenditures. I see no reason why there should be a third agency created under OEO to do work which historically and properly should be done by Labor or HEW.

It is my feeling that there should be a much greater involvement of officials and civic leaders at the State and local levels because special programs to meet unique needs should and could be tailored to the particular circumstances of the areas involved.

I also feel that it is most imperative that some sort of incentive be found to keep the enrollees in the Job Corps camps for a longer period of time so that the desired benefits may be achieved.

The cost per enrollee of the Job Corps is far too high to attain the public acceptance and cooperation which are necessary to its success.

I believe it would be proper and practical to place the Headstart program in the Department of Education. The program would benefit from a much greater involvement of the State and local departments of education, and there should be far more cooperation and less com-

petition between the State and local authorities on the one hand and the Federal authorities on the other.

With regard to the community action program, I get the feeling that some groups consider the OEO as an invitation and means of financing the organization of a political group to rebel against the so-called power structure or establishment. I do not believe it should be the purpose of poverty funds to finance political organizations.

In the matter of the legal assistance program, an excellent and badly needed idea may become a mismanaged travesty in the hands of self-serving opportunists, and guarantees and restrictions to guard against this should be part of the bill.

In the matter of the credit unions, I feel that the bill should contain exact and explicit guidelines and safeguards in order to insure protection for those that the credit unions are designed to help.

Late experience in several parts of the country has convinced me more than ever that absolute prohibitions against the use of poverty funds and poverty workers for political activities must be written into the law to provide proper use of these public funds. It is also my opinion that this matter should be reviewed by some department or agency outside of the OEO.

The Governor's veto, as it was first in the bill should, by all means, be restored. This veto power, I feel strongly, should also cover the title 3 migrant program.

With regard to the emergency employment program, here again we seem to be faced with a lack of planning, a lack of definition, a lack of guidelines, and an absence of complete preparation. In good conscience, I cannot agree to spending \$2.8 billion of taxpayers' dollars on such a program.

GEORGE MURPHY.

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF MR. GRIFFIN

While I voted to report the bill, S. 1545, I believe title II should be referred back to the committee for appropriate hearings and study. In addition, I am convinced that several of the programs authorized by this legislation would operate more effectively if certain amendments were adopted on the floor.

A. JOB CORPS

It is gratifying to note that some of the criticisms directed at this part finally have been recognized, and revisions are being made. This bill tightens the administration of the Job Corps program, provides specifically for urban skill centers, and improves the machinery for followup and job placement.

I believe that the Job Corps should be administered by the Office of Education instead of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Such a transfer would help to eliminate areas of overlap between Job Corps and other vocational education programs being conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is worth noting that at present the bulk of the Job Corps training effort is in its 28 urban centers; and that 20 of those centers—more than 70 percent of the total—are run by private enterprise, under contract with OEO. A study made for the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty as a part of its 1967 review of the war on poverty indicates that private enterprise is generally doing a better job than nonprofit organizations in operating centers and training enrollees. The record would seem to justify an expansion of the practice of contracting with private firms for the operation of Job Corps centers.

I also believe that more involvement by the States would be desirable. The mandatory language of section 114 of the pending bill is a move in that direction. As Consultant Sar A. Levitan has pointed out (Levitan, "Can the War on Poverty Rise Above Partisan Politics?" Congressional Record, Aug. 8, 1967, A4024 at A4025):

* * * The Job Corps has not sufficiently utilized the educational and vocational capabilities of States. It could have avoided a great many problems if State agencies had been drawn into the administration of centers.

The data developed by the Job Corps indicate that some conservation centers in particular do a poor educational job. The situation may be corrected by turning these centers over to the State educational agencies.

Section 108(b) of the pending bill expressly authorizes the use of local educational agencies, vocational institutions, and technical institutes. This provision contains significant potential for reestablishing a more appropriate Federal-local balance.

In 1964 as a Member of the House of Representatives, I joined in minority views when the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

was reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor. In those views, Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, a distinguished psychologist and professor in the Departments of Psychology and of Child Development and Family Relationships of Cornell University, was quoted as follows (H. Rept. 1458, 88th Cong., second sess., 71):

Unless the young person is trained in a job which his home community can use, unless he has learned patterns of social and civic behavior which are appropriate to that community, and unless that community is prepared to accept him in a new and more positive role, the young person will return only to be pushed back into the part in which he was formerly cast—the social misfit.

We added:

The need is to equip these young people to cope with their community: the need is not to equip them to commune with nature.

During the past 3 years painful experience has indicated the validity of that point. Clearly, community coordination is essential to a program designed to enable youths to join the community.

B. TITLE I-B

The 1967 amendments would place title I-B under a "prime sponsor" which, in most instances, would be the community action agency established under title II. The CAA is "encouraged" to use public and private organizations as delegate agencies, to include the poor in planning, in the conduct and administration of programs, and also to provide maximum employment and training opportunities for such persons. The original title I-B was the "Neighborhood Youth Corps," limited to persons in the ninth to 12th grades. As revised, the part combines a series of work and training programs for persons age 16 and over and an array of other enumerated "special programs" oriented to the employment of persons of all ages. It adds a program for areas of concentrated unemployment and a private employer incentive program. The CAA is directed to provide systematic planning and linkage (in sec. 121(c)).

I am concerned that the task of coordination as well as the administration of such a conglomeration and proliferation of purposes, participants, and special activities, will overwhelm the administrative capacities of CAA's; some of them have not distinguished themselves in the past as models of administrative efficiency.

In the 1964 minority views, discussing the Neighborhood Youth Corps, we warned (H. Rept. 1458, 73):

As with the Job Corps proposal, the contribution, if any, that this program will make toward equipping young people for employment is highly questionable. Having recently approved a vocational work-study program for youth in this age group, and having expanded the Manpower Act to assist the same individuals, Congress should place its reliance upon these established Federal activities rather than embarking upon new, costly, ill-considered efforts which would only compete with and confuse the existing programs.

Unfortunately, subsequent events have borne out the accuracy of that warning. A subcommittee publication entitled "Emergency Employment Act—Background Information" states (Mangum, "The Need for an Employment Guarantee," 131):

* * * NYC [Neighborhood Youth Corps] and Job Corps graduates face the same job markets after leaving the programs that they faced before, one-half of the public-assistance recipients who enter work experience and training program return to public assistance when they leave it.

A private survey recently revealed that only 38.2 percent of out-of-school NYC enrollees return to school, receive additional training, or are employed after completing the program. ("Youth and the War on Poverty," prepared for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 29.)

Indeed, as it is operated, the prime function of the NYC may be merely that of an "aging vat" to tide teenagers over until they are able to apply for "real" jobs. While this limited function may have some merit, the NYC experience could be far more meaningful if the NYC program measured up to its initial purpose—to enable participants to attend school or to help them "develop their maximum occupational potential." (Sec. 112 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.)

The inschool title I-B program was designed as an educational, training, and income maintenance program. In my view, this educational program should be transferred to the Office of Education and administered in coordination with other work-study programs. Such a transfer would help preserve the original purpose of the section, reduce overlapping and duplicitous efforts, and would assure that contracts with school systems would be made through the Office of Education.

In addition, I believe that the out-of-school title I-B program should be transferred to, and administered by, the Department of Labor. That Department would then be in a position to bring these programs into closer coordination with other job training programs—programs which are more closely related to the needs of the job market.

The isolation of Youth Corps programs from "real" jobs could well explain the difficulty experienced in some cities in recruiting enrollees. Understandably, eligible youths see little future in devoting themselves to morale-deflating, make-work projects. As the subcommittee's publication points out (Mangum, 131 at 133):

The assumption that the out-of-school, out-of-work youth is eager for steady, low-wage, low prestige job clashes with experience.

The committee added \$10 million to the title I-B authorization for pilot projects in which OEO would provide incentives for the private employment of "hard core" unemployables. The employees would work for private employers, who would be expected to provide useful training and supportive services. Under this amendment, employees would receive not less than the Federal minimum wage; and OEO could pay the employer any difference between a worker's real worth and his wage rate, as well as other costs, such as the expenses of counseling, recruiting, and transportation.

I have long advocated measures to encourage private industry to train and employ marginal workers, but I am concerned that the approach adopted for the first time in this bill contains pitfalls. I am pleased that the program wisely has been advanced as a pilot project only, so that potential problems may be explored and satisfactory limitations and guidelines may be developed if necessary.

Along with a number of other Members of Congress, I have sponsored a bill entitled the "Human Investment Act," which seeks to provide a tax credit for private employers who hire and train the hard-core unemployed. I believe this approach would be preferable.

C. COMMUNITY ACTION

The 1966 requirement that from 5 to 10 percent of community action funds be channeled to local groups outside the community action agency has been deleted. In its place the pending bill provides (in sec. 220(c)) that the Director "may and is encouraged to" assist agencies other than the CAA to carry out component programs. However, the new language qualifies the Director's authority by prescribing that he may act only "after soliciting and considering comments of the community action agency."

The broadening of CAA control may serve to strengthen citywide coordination; however, in some instances it could also result in the curbing of individual local initiative. For example, if "city hall" controls the CAA, and if the poor mistrust "city hall," then the poor can be expected to mistrust the CAA. In such situations, there may be understandable hesitation on the part of the poor to participate to the "maximum feasible" extent in CAA-run programs. Yet, such participation is supposed to be a key element in the philosophy and purposes of the act.

Accordingly, it is hoped that the Director will take appropriate advantage of the authority which is left in section 220(c) to assist local groups outside the CAA where circumstances justify it.

OEO involvement with education

In my view, the OEO should not become intimately involved with ongoing educational programs. Those poverty programs which are essentially part of the educational process should be transferred to, and administered by, the Office of Education. I refer in particular to the following:

- (i) Title I-B work-training (in its education aspects).
- (ii) Headstart (and see below).
- (iii) Follow Through (and see below).
- (iv) Upward Bound.

The Headstart program, according to OEO Director Sargent Shriver, is OEO's "greatest single measurable success." The Job Corps has been vehemently attacked because of scandalously high costs and the misconduct of some enrollees. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has been criticized because of its failure to provide meaningful work and training instead of make-work, and community action programs have been under attack because of administrative floundering and politicking. On the other hand, Headstart, in most instances, has been the one shining light that has rallied public support for the poverty war. Many constituents have told me that they think the whole "war on poverty" program should be scrapped, except for Headstart.

Because of the recognized merit of Headstart, Republican members of the committee proposed that \$352 million of the funds to be authorized be earmarked specifically for Headstart. However, this proposal was rejected by majority members. I believe an amendment to accomplish this purpose should be adopted on the floor so that Headstart will not be forced to compete with other schemes and proposals for the administrative favor of OEO.

OEO is talking about spending \$120 million in the coming year for its new Follow Through program. From all indications, such a sum vastly exceeds the amount needed for the number of programs which can be reasonably mobilized within the year. By now OEO should have learned the price of hasty overspending on new programs. We believe that a substantial portion of the excessive Follow Through funds should be redirected to Headstart.

Follow Through, a \$120 million/\$160 per child program, contains particularly disturbing implications respecting the established system of Federal-State-local relationships. The program focuses on Headstart children as they go on to kindergarten and the first three grades of elementary school. Thus, the program initiates the actual involvement of OEO in the educational process within the school system. Evidently the involvement contemplated is not limited to contacts with the State agency or local board. Instead, Follow Through envisions the actual conduct of inschool programs by CAA's or their delegate agencies.

What is the extent of the planned OEO involvement with the educational process in Follow Through? The language in the bill is ambiguous. Section 243(4) purports to prohibit general aid to education, but it adds, "other than for special health, welfare, remedial, and other noncurricular services designed to encourage successful participation in school"—whatever that may mean. Further doubts are cast upon the section 243 disclaimer by section 221, which describes Follow Through and other "special impact" programs. Section 221(b)(2) authorizes, as a part of the program, "comprehensive services * * * as described in [the Headstart paragraph]," and that paragraph, detailing the preschool program, expressly cites "comprehensive health, nutritional, *education*, social, and other services." [Emphasis added.]

Section 222 requires the maximum employment of the poor in all component programs. Presumably, this requires the CAA to assure that a maximum number of poor persons are brought into the schools to work on Follow Through projects. Also, VISTA workers could be assigned to these programs. In my view, while involvement of the poor in other OEO programs is important, employment policies within the Nation's schools should be left to appropriate school authorities.

Finally, section 221(b)(2) describes Follow Through as "focused primarily upon children * * * who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs." Accordingly, it appears that children who needed Headstart training but did not get it, for one reason or another, will generally be excluded from the benefits of Follow Through.

As now written, provisions of the bill authorizing the new Follow Through program are loosely worded and leave much to be desired. I believe the language should be revised and tightened.

The above-mentioned 1964 minority views in which I participated foresaw the danger of increasing OEO involvement in areas properly

within the jurisdiction of other agencies. At that time, we predicted that (H. Rept. 1458, 70):

* * * This reliance on broad, undefined power [for OEO] with its companion reliance on direct Federal action at all levels of our society, represents a dangerous assault on the established system of State-Federal relationships, as well as upon the orderly administration of programs and policies already entrusted to established agencies of Government.

Unfortunately, it is obvious that the assault continues, and jurisdictional overlap within the Federal executive branch is increasing.

D. DAY CARE

A new title V-B has been added to give express authority for establishment of day care projects so that low-income parents may engage in education, training, or work.

In addition to making it possible for individual adults to improve or advance themselves, a well-run day care center may have other desirable effects. For example, it can provide poor children with needed nutritional and social development benefits.

In the administration of the day care program it is hoped that there will not be a repeat of those notorious Headstart "poverty" programs under which 20 to 30 percent of the participants came from middle-income families. Obviously, when children from middle-income families are recruited and allowed to take advantage of programs intended to help the poor, not only are the taxpayers cheated but, in some instances, needy children are deprived of opportunities which the act seeks to provide.

E. FUTURE OF OEO

A central issue underlying any discussion of the poverty war, I believe, is the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have recommended the transfer of Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and certain community action programs to other Federal agencies. I advocate such transfers because I believe it is in the national interest to structure an antipoverty effort that will minimize—not maximize—the overlap, competition, and duplication of efforts.

A basic myth surrounds the Office of Economic Opportunity: the myth that OEO neatly plans and organizes the Nation's anti-poverty effort. It does not. On paper, OEO is part of the Executive Office of the President. But, in fact, it enjoys no special status comparable, for example, to the Bureau of the Budget. Rather it has become just another operating agency, like HEW, the Department of Labor, and other departments.

As a staff report to the Senate subcommittee observed (JLS, "Issues of Organization and Coordination," June 16, 1967, 2):

(I)t was inevitable that its [OEO's] operating responsibilities would absorb virtually all of the energies of its leadership and that its Government-wide "Chief of Staff" functions would suffer. As the consequence, a full-fledged headquarters for the war on poverty as a whole has not developed.

OEO is not fulfilling its primary role as leader, planner, and coordinator of the poverty war because it is too busy with the myriad of details involved in operating the various poverty programs.

I do not suggest that OEO must be abolished. But I do believe it should be reorganized—if not administratively, then legislatively.

A reorganized and reoriented Office of Economic Opportunity could finally perform the most important function originally intended for it. In form OEO would be smaller, since it would be freed from day-to-day routine formalities and operational paperwork. However, the service of OEO to the country should be far more significant than it is today. For the first time it could actually concentrate on becoming the planning and coordinating agency of the 3-year-old war on poverty.

F. EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

Unrest in the cities of the Nation has reached grave proportions. The tremendous amalgam of social problems that gives rise to this unrest demands our most urgent attention. But this is a situation in which greater, not less, congressional wisdom is imperative.

Title II, the so-called "Emergency Employment Act," is an unfortunate example of hasty, unsound congressional reaction to the riots. It is as extravagant in its promise as it is vague in its operation.

The committee has had no real opportunity to consider the proposal in depth.

The record contains no statement of the administration's views regarding the merits of the program, its effect on the poverty war or on the budget.

How such a program would relate to ongoing job creation and training programs has not been explored.

Finally, consideration has not been given to more effective alternatives that are available, e.g., the Human Investment Act proposal which would encourage private industry to hire and train the hard-core unemployed.

Instead of holding hearings, the subcommittee released a booklet entitled "Emergency Employment Act—Background Materials." The booklet is supposed to establish the need for title II. In fact, however, the material also emphasizes that superficial, short-term make-work programs do not solve long-term unemployment problems, and that efforts should be directed toward training and education.

As written, the title would constitute a virtual abdication of congressional responsibility; it would delegate almost unlimited authority and discretion to the Secretary of Labor.

Before Congress approves an expenditure of nearly \$3 billion, principally for make-work, no-future "public service" jobs, at least some time should be taken to consider whether that approach is the best of those available.

Unfortunately, weighing alternatives and developing major legislation takes a little time. Nevertheless, I believe it is time that should be taken. The committee should conduct appropriate hearings on title II.

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.



Calendar No. 548

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2388

[Report No. 563]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

SEPTEMBER 12 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 11), 1967

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported the following bill; which was read twice and ordered to be placed on the Calendar

A BILL

To provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity
4 Amendments of 1967".

5 AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

6 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under
7 the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C

1 of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be ap-
2 propriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the
3 sum of \$2,258,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions
4 of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or
5 made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$295,-
6 000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
7 part A of title I of such Act, \$567,000,000 for the purpose
8 of carrying out part B of title I, \$105,000,000 for the pur-
9 pose of carrying out part D of title I, \$1,062,000,000 for the
10 purpose of carrying out title II, \$20,000,000 for the pur-
11 pose of carrying out part A of title III, \$30,000,000 for the
12 purpose of carrying out part B of title III, \$25,000,000 for
13 the purpose of carrying out section 406 of title IV, \$70,000,-
14 000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title V, \$35,-
15 000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title V,
16 \$16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and
17 \$33,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and
18 for the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be
19 appropriated.

20 **TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC**
21 **OPPORTUNITY ACT**

22 **JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS**

23 **SEC. 101.** Part A of title I of the Economic Oppor-
24 tunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

1 "PART A—JOB CORPS

2 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

3 "SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-
4 income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth
5 standards and procedures for selecting individuals as en-
6 rollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of
7 residential centers in which enrollees will participate in
8 intensive programs of education, vocational training, work
9 experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes
10 various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to
11 the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps.
12 Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can
13 benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in
14 a group setting, to become more responsible, employable,
15 and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that con-
16 tributes, where feasible, to the development of National,
17 State, and community resources, and to the development
18 and dissemination of techniques for working with the dis-
19 advantaged that can be widely utilized by public and
20 private institutions and agencies.

21 "ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

22 "SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office
23 of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

1 “INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

2 “SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a
3 young man or woman must be a person who—

4 “(1) is a permanent resident of the United States
5 who has attained age sixteen but not attained age twenty-
6 two at the time of enrollment;

7 “(2) is a low-income individual or member of a
8 low-income family who requires additional education,
9 training, or intensive counseling and related assistance
10 in order to secure or hold meaningful employment,
11 participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify
12 for other training programs suitable to his needs or satisfy
13 Armed Forces requirements;

14 “(3) is currently living in an environment so char-
15 acterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife
16 or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair
17 his prospects for successful participation in any other
18 program providing needed training, education, or assist-
19 ance;

20 “(4) is determined, after careful screening as pro-
21 vided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present
22 capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure
23 the full benefit of the program authorized in this part,
24 and to be free of medical and behaviorial problems so
25 serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust

1 to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern
2 of work and training which that program involves; and

3 “(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as
4 the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with
5 all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

6 “SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL
7 PROVISIONS

8 “SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary
9 rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enroll-
10 ment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these
11 rules shall be implemented through arrangements which
12 make use of appropriate agencies and organizations such as
13 community action agencies, public employment offices, pro-
14 fessional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall
15 establish specific standards and procedures for conducting
16 screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruit-
17 ment through agencies and individuals having contact with
18 youths over substantial periods of time and able, accord-
19 ingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and
20 problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with
21 other individuals and organizations, including courts, proba-
22 tion and parole offices, law enforcement authorities, schools,
23 welfare agencies, and medical agencies, and advisers. They
24 shall also provide for—

1 “(1) the interviewing of each applicant for the pur-
2 pose of—

3 “(A) determining whether his educational and
4 vocational needs can best be met through the Job
5 Corps or any alternative program in his home
6 community;

7 “(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent
8 data relating to his background, needs, and interests
9 for evaluation in determining his eligibility and po-
10 tential assignment; and

11 “(C) giving the applicant a full understand-
12 ing of the Job Corps program and making clear
13 what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the
14 event of his acceptance.

15 “(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic in-
16 quiry concerning the applicant's background for the
17 effective development and, as appropriate, clarification
18 of information concerning his age, citizenship, school
19 and draft status, health, employability, past behavior,
20 family income, environment, and other matters related
21 to a determination of his eligibility.

22 “(b) The Director shall make no payments to any in-
23 dividual or organization solely as compensation for the serv-
24 ice of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the
25 Job Corps.

1 “(c) The Director shall take all necessary steps to as-
2 sure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an ap-
3 propriate number of candidates selected from rural areas,
4 taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who
5 reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential fa-
6 cilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide
7 geographic dispersion.

8 “SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

9 “SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an
10 enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable
11 expectation that he can participate successfully in group
12 situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not
13 likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent
14 other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program
15 or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline
16 and satisfactory relationships between any center to which
17 he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that
18 he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which
19 he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to
20 observe those rules. Before selecting an individual who has
21 a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or
22 property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction or
23 other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain
24 a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows
25 his individual situation that there is reasonable expectation

1 that the opportunity provided by the Job Corps will help
2 him to overcome his problem.

3 “(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enroll-
4 ment may be selected even though he is on probation or
5 parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision
6 of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually
7 satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not
8 violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director
9 has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and
10 all reports to State or other authorities that may be neces-
11 sary to comply with applicable probation or parole require-
12 ments.

13 “ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

14 “SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the
15 Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director
16 may authorize in special cases.

17 “(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve
18 any individual of obligations under the Universal Military
19 Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

20 “(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of
21 Cuba described in section 609 (3) of this Act) must take
22 and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form:
23 ‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and
24 allegiance to the United States of America and will support
25 and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States

1 against all its enemies foreign and domestic.' The provi-
2 sions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall
3 be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

4 “(d) Each enrollee shall be assigned to a center appro-
5 priate to his needs, as determined by the Director, which
6 (taking into account current vacancies and requirements for
7 the efficient program operation) is closest to the residence of
8 such enrollee.

9 “JOB CORPS CENTERS

10 “SEC. 107. (a) The Director may make agreements with
11 Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for
12 the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These
13 centers shall be primarily residential in character and shall
14 be designated and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a
15 well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training,
16 work experience (either in direct program activities or
17 through arrangements with employers), counseling and other
18 services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall in-
19 clude conservation centers to be located primarily in rural
20 areas and to provide, in addition to other training and as-
21 sistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities
22 to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or
23 public recreational areas or to assist in developing community
24 projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's
25 training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas

1 and to provide activities which shall include training and
2 other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected
3 to participate successfully in training for specific types of
4 skilled or semiskilled employment; and women's training cen-
5 ters, to be located in either urban or rural areas, and which
6 shall provide education, training, and other activities appro-
7 priate to the special needs and potentialities of young women.

8 “(b) To the extent feasible, men's and women's train-
9 ing centers shall offer education and vocational training op-
10 portunities, together with supportive services, on a nonresi-
11 dential basis to enrollees in programs described in part B of
12 this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimburs-
13 able basis or through such other arrangements as the Direc-
14 tor may specify.

15 “PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

16 “SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be oper-
17 ated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-orga-
18 nized and fully supervised program of education, vocational
19 training, work experience, planned avocational and recrea-
20 tional activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and
21 counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required pro-
22 gram for each enrollee shall include activities designed to
23 assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with
24 problems he may encounter in his home community or in
25 adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing

1 his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-
2 term upward mobility. Center programs shall include re-
3 quired participation in center maintenance support and
4 related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in
5 increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and
6 discipline.

7 “(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may ar-
8 range for enrollee education and vocational training through
9 local public or private educational agencies, vocational educa-
10 tional institutions, or technical institutes where these institu-
11 tions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and
12 substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could
13 provide through other means.

14 “(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent
15 feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain
16 the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;
17 and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of
18 Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to
19 be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their
20 services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee’s
21 level of educational attainment.

22 “(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure
23 that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do
24 not displace presently employed workers or impair existing

1 contracts for service and will be coordinated with other
2 work-experience programs in the community.

3 "ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

4 "SEC. 109. (a) The Director may provide enrollees
5 with such personal travel and leave allowances, and such
6 quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing,
7 recreational services, and other expenses as he may deem
8 necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances
9 shall be established at a rate not to exceed \$35 per month
10 during the first six months of an enrollee's participation in the
11 program and in not to exceed \$65 per month thereafter, ex-
12 cept that allowances in excess of \$35 per month, but not
13 exceeding \$65 per month, may be provided from the be-
14 ginning of an enrollee's participation if it is expected to be
15 of less than six months' duration, and the Director is author-
16 ized to pay personal allowances in excess of the rates speci-
17 fied herein in unusual circumstances as determined by him.
18 Such allowances shall be graduated up to the maximum so as
19 to encourage continued participation in the program, achieve-
20 ment and the best use by the enrollee of the funds so provided
21 and shall be subject to reduction in appropriate cases as a
22 disciplinary measure. To the degree reasonable, enrollees
23 shall be required to meet or contribute to costs associated
24 with their individual comfort and enjoyment from their per-
25 sonal allowances.

1 “(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules govern-
2 ing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of
3 emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs
4 connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed
5 at least six months service in the Job Corps.

6 “(c) The Director shall provide each former enrollee,
7 upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to
8 exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the
9 Job Corps: *Provided, however,* That no enrollee shall be en-
10 titled to that portion of a readjustment allowance which is not
11 paid pursuant to subsection (d) of this section unless he has
12 remained in the program at least one hundred and eighty
13 days, except that such portion shall be paid to an enrollee
14 who has remained in the program at least ninety days and
15 whose participation in the program is expected to be of less
16 than six months’ duration, and except in unusual circum-
17 stances as determined by the Director. The Director may,
18 from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee
19 such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director
20 deems necessary to meet extraordinary financial obligations
21 incurred by that enrollee. In the event of an enrollee’s death
22 during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid read-
23 justment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the pro-
24 visions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

1 “(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may
2 determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an
3 enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory
4 service may be paid during the period of service of the en-
5 rollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any
6 other relative who draws substantial support from the en-
7 rollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the
8 payment of an equal amount by the Director.

9 “STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

10 “SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of
11 conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently
12 enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees,
13 dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations
14 shall be made in every instance where it is determined that
15 retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center,
16 will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct
17 and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other
18 enrollees.

19 “(b) In order to promote the proper moral and dis-
20 ciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors
21 of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take
22 appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including,
23 but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to
24 expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as pro-
25 vided under regulation set by the Director.

1 “COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

2 “SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall
3 cooperate in activities designed to establish mutually bene-
4 ficial relationships between Job Corps centers and sur-
5 rounding or nearby communities.

6 “COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT

7 “SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the
8 counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to
9 follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.

10 “(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee
11 prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabil-
12 ities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for
13 which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or
14 shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In
15 placing enollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United
16 States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

17 “(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements
18 to determine the status and progress of terminees and to
19 assure that their needs for further education, training, and
20 counseling may be met.

21 “(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy
22 of his pertinent records, including data derived from his
23 counseling and testing, other than confidential information,
24 shall be made available immediately to the Department of
25 Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

1 “(e) The Director shall, to the extent feasible in ac-
2 cordance with section 637 (b) of this Act, arrange for the
3 readjustment allowance provided for in section 109 (c) of
4 such Act, less any sums already paid pursuant to subsection
5 (d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have
6 not already found employment) at the public employment
7 service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee,
8 if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office
9 to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated
10 an intent to reside. The Director shall seek to make arrange-
11 ments by which public employment service officers will main-
12 tain records regarding former enrollees who are thus paid
13 at such offices including information as to—

14 “(1) the number of former enrollees who have de-
15 clined the offices’ help in finding a job;

16 “(2) the number who were successfully placed in
17 jobs without further education or training;

18 “(3) the number who were found to require further
19 training before being placed in jobs and the types of
20 training programs in which they participated; and

21 “(4) the number who were found to require fur-
22 ther remedial or basic education in order to qualify for
23 training programs, together with information as to the
24 types of programs for which such former enrollees were
25 found unqualified for enrollment.

1 If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of
2 any other public or private organization or agency in lieu
3 of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that
4 organization or agency to make the payment of the readjust-
5 ment allowance and maintain the same types of records re-
6 garding former enrollees as are herein specified for mainte-
7 nance by public employment service offices. In the case of
8 enrollees who are placed in jobs by the Director prior to the
9 termination of their participation in the Job Corps, the
10 Director shall maintain records providing pertinent place-
11 ment and follow-up information.

12 "EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL
13 PROJECTS

14 "SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the care-
15 ful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program,
16 directly or by contracting for independent evaluations,
17 with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as prac-
18 ticable, and providing information needed to assess the
19 effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods
20 of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to de-
21 termine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of res-
22 idential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use
23 of facilities combining residential and nonresidential com-
24 ponents, from the use of centers with large as opposed to

1 small enrollments, and from the use of different types of
2 program sponsors, including public agencies, universities,
3 and private corporations. The evaluation shall also include
4 comparisons with proper control groups composed of per-
5 sons who have not participated in the program. In carrying
6 out such evaluations, the Director shall arrange for
7 obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths
8 and weaknesses of the program and shall consult with
9 other agencies and officials in order to compare the rel-
10 ative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those
11 used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through
12 employers, schools, or other Government and private agen-
13 cies specific information concerning the residence of former
14 enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and suc-
15 cess in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure,
16 to the extent feasible, similar information directly from
17 enrollees at appropriate intervals following their comple-
18 tion of the Job Corps program. The results of such evalua-
19 tion shall be published and shall be summarized in the report
20 required by section 608.

21 “(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or
22 contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration proj-
23 ects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the
24 better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjust-
25 ment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduc-

tion in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transportation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under this part. These projects shall include one or more projects providing youths with education, training, and other supportive services on a combined residential and nonresidential basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this subsection shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related programs or projects and with the prime work and training sponsors, as described in part B of this title in the communities where the projects will be carried out. They may be undertaken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted programs, including programs under part B of this title, and funds otherwise available for activities under those programs shall, with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be available to projects under this section to the extent they include the same or substantially similar activities. The Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility

1 and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by
2 section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the
3 Congress concerning the actions taken under this section,
4 including a full description of progress made in connection
5 with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

6 “(c) In order to determine whether upgraded voca-
7 tional education schools could eliminate or substantially re-
8 duce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how
9 communities could make maximum utilization of expensive
10 educational and training facilities, the Director, in coopera-
11 tion with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into
12 one or more agreements with State educational agencies to
13 pay the cost of establishing and operating model community
14 vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities
15 shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high
16 dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a
17 need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill
18 center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it
19 contains provisions designed to assure that—

20 “(1) a job survey be made of the area;

21 “(2) the training program of the school and skill
22 center reflect the job market needs as projected by the
23 survey;

24 “(3) an advisory committee composed of repre-
25 sentatives of business, labor, education, and community

1 leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to
2 make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;

3 “(4) arrangements have been worked out with
4 schools in the area and the administrator of the skill
5 center for maximum utilization of the center both during
6 and after school hours; and

7 “(5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as
8 the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem
9 necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will
10 be provided.

11 “PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

12 “SEC. 114. (a) The Director shall take necessary action
13 to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job
14 Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation
15 with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to
16 the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of en-
17 rollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaning-
18 ful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and
19 coordination with State-operated programs.

20 “(b) The Director may enter into agreements with
21 States to assist in the operation or administration of State-
22 operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part.
23 The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of
24 the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

1 “(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility
2 designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be estab-
3 lished within a State unless a plan setting forth such pro-
4 posed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and
5 such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days
6 of such submission.

7 “APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

8 “SEC. 115. (a) Except as otherwise specifically pro-
9 vided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees
10 in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees
11 and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to
12 Federal employment, including those regarding hours of
13 work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compen-
14 sation, and Federal employee benefits:

15 “(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of
16 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security
17 Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed em-
18 ployees of the United States and any service performed by an
19 individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in
20 the employ of the United States.

21 “(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of
22 title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation
23 to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be
24 deemed civil employees of the United States within the
25 meaning of the term ‘employee’ as defined in section 8101 of

1 title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that sub-
2 chapter shall apply except as follows:

3 “(A) The term ‘performance of duty’ shall not in-
4 clude any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her
5 assigned post of duty, except while participating in an
6 activity (including an activity while on pass or during
7 travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or
8 under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

9 “(B) In computing compensation benefits for dis-
10 ability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be
11 deemed that received under the entrance salary for a
12 grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of
13 title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

14 “(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to
15 accrue until the day following the date on which the
16 injured enrollee is terminated.

17 “(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions
18 in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered
19 employees of the Government.

20 “(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to
21 persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job
22 Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and
23 it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United
24 States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not
25 exceeding \$500.

1 “(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are de-
2 tailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements
3 made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not
4 be counted in computing strength under any law limiting
5 the strength of such services or in computing the percentage
6 authorized by law for any grade therein.

7 “SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

8 “SEC. 116. (a) The Director shall not use any funds
9 made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year
10 ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase above
11 forty-five thousand the enrollee capacity of Job Corps centers.

12 “(b) The Director shall take necessary action to assure
13 that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of
14 Job Corps enrollees in residence and receiving training, at
15 least 25 per centum shall be women.

16 “(c) The Director shall take necessary action to assure
17 that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job
18 Corps centers which have been in operation for more than
19 nine months do not exceed \$7,300 per enrollee.

20 “(d) The Director shall take necessary action to assure
21 that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced
22 or developed with Federal funds in the course of the opera-
23 tion of any conservation or training center shall become the
24 property of the United States.

1 "POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

2 "SEC. 117. (a) No officer or employee of the executive
3 branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry
4 concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee
5 or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures
6 concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such
7 membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes
8 by law a disqualification for Government employment. No
9 discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by
10 any person in the executive branch of the Federal Govern-
11 ment against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or
12 any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his
13 political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically
14 authorized or required by law.

15 "(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall
16 take any active part in political management or in political
17 campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to
18 statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use
19 his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering
20 with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such
21 persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and
22 to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all
23 political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee,
24 enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political

1 purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation
2 of the Corrupt Practices Act.

3 “(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Com-
4 mission finds that any person has violated the foregoing pro-
5 visions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for
6 explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned,
7 certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as
8 to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.”

9 WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

10 SEC. 102. Part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity
11 Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

12 “PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

13 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

14 “SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful
15 work and training opportunities, together with related serv-
16 ices and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to
17 continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed
18 or low-income persons, both young and adult, to obtain and
19 hold regular competitive employment, with maximum oppor-
20 tunities for local initiative in developing programs which
21 respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis
22 upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs
23 using both public and private resources to overcome the
24 complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in

1 urban and rural areas having high concentrations or propor-
2 tions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

3 “COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE WORK
4 AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

5 “SEC. 121. (a) The Director shall designate or recog-
6 nize community program areas for the purpose of planning
7 and conducting comprehensive community work and training
8 programs.

9 “(b) For the purpose of this title, a community may be
10 a city, county, multicity or multicounty unit, an Indian res-
11 ervation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of
12 boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suit-
13 able organizational base and possesses the commonality of
14 interest needed for a comprehensive work and training pro-
15 gram. The Director shall consult with the heads of other
16 Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to com-
17 munity action, manpower services physical and economic
18 development, housing, education, health, and other commu-
19 nity services to encourage the establishment of coterminous
20 or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among
21 those programs and comprehensive work and training pro-
22 grams assisted under this title.

23 “(c) A comprehensive work and training program must

1 seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of serv-
2 ices which will enable them to obtain and hold employment.
3 It shall provide a systematic approach to planning and
4 implementation including the linkage of relevant compo-
5 nent programs authorized by this Act with one another and
6 with other appropriate public and private programs and activ-
7 ities. It shall also provide for evaluation.

8 "PRIME SPONSORS AND DELEGATE AGENCIES

9 "SEC. 122. (a) For each community program area, the
10 Director shall recognize a public or private nonprofit agency
11 which shall serve as the prime sponsor to receive funds under
12 section 123 (except as otherwise provided in section 123
13 (c)). This agency must be capable of planning, adminis-
14 tering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work
15 and training program.

16 "(b) The prime sponsor shall be the community action
17 agency unless the Director determines, in accordance with
18 such regulations as he may prescribe, that an alternative
19 prime sponsor is likely to have greater capability in planning
20 and implementing a comprehensive work and training
21 program.

22 "(c) The prime sponsor shall provide for participation
23 of employers and labor organizations in the planning and
24 conduct of the comprehensive work and training programs.

25 "(d) The prime sponsor shall be encouraged to make

1 use of public and private organizations as delegate
2 agencies to carry out components of the comprehen-
3 sive work and training program, including without lim-
4 itation agencies governed with the participation of the
5 poor and other residents of the neighborhoods or rural areas
6 served, educational institutions, the public employment serv-
7 ice, the public welfare agency, other health and welfare
8 agencies, private training institutions, and other capable
9 public and private organizations.

10 “(e) The prime sponsor and delegate agencies shall
11 provide for participation of residents of the area and mem-
12 bers of the groups served in the planning, conduct, and
13 evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program
14 and its components. Such persons shall be provided maximum
15 employment opportunity in the conduct of component pro-
16 grams, including opportunity for further occupational train-
17 ing and career advancement.

18 “(f) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure
19 that programs under this part have adequate internal admin-
20 istrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel stand-
21 ards, evaluation procedures and other policies as may be
22 necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

23 “ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

24 “SEC. 123. (a) The Director may provide financial as-
25 sistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work

1 and training programs or components of such programs,
2 including the following:

3 “(1) programs to provide part-time employment,
4 on-the-job training, and useful work experience for stu-
5 dents from low-income families who are in the ninth
6 through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equiv-
7 alent to that of students in such grades) and who are in
8 need of the earnings to permit them to resume or main-
9 tain attendance in school;

10 “(2) programs to provide unemployed, underem-
11 ployed, or low-income persons (aged sixteen and over)
12 with useful work and training (which must include
13 sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job
14 training) designed to assist those persons to develop
15 their maximum occupational potential and to obtain
16 regular competitive employment;

17 “(3) special programs which involve work ac-
18 tivities directed to the needs of those chronically un-
19 employed poor who have poor employment prospects
20 and are unable, because of age, lack of employment op-
21 portunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employ-
22 ment or training assistance under other programs, and
23 which, in addition to other services provided, will
24 enable such persons to participate in projects for the
25 betterment or beautification of the community or area

served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands;

“(4) special programs which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields including without limitation health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement;

“(5) special programs which concentrate work and training resources in urban and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed persons, which are appropriately focused to assure that work and training opportunities are extended to the most severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be

1 expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which
2 are supported by specific commitments of cooperation
3 from private and public employers;

4 “(6) supportive and follow-up services to supple-
5 ment work and training programs under this or other
6 Acts including health services, counseling, day care for
7 children, transportation assistance, and other special
8 services necessary to assist individuals to achieve suc-
9 cess in work and training programs and in employment;

10 “(7) employment centers and mobile employment
11 service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and
12 placement services, conveniently located in urban neigh-
13 borhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the
14 most disadvantaged;

15 “(8) programs to provide incentives to private
16 employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train
17 or employ unemployed or low-income persons, includ-
18 ing arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to
19 employers for a limited period when an employee might
20 not be fully productive, payment of on-the-job counsel-
21 ing and other supportive services, payment of all or part
22 of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and
23 rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of un-
24 employed or low-income persons, and payments to per-

1 mit employers to provide employees resident in such
2 areas with transportation to and from work or to reim-
3 burse such employees for such transportation: *Provided*,
4 That in making such reimbursements to employers the
5 Director shall assure that the wages paid any employee
6 shall not be less than the minimum wage which would
7 be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor
8 Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied
9 to the employee and he was not exempt under section
10 13 thereof; and

11 “(9) means of planning, administering, coordinat-
12 ing, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training
13 program.

14 “(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training
15 component programs conducted in a community under this
16 section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work
17 and training program and financial assistance for such com-
18 ponents shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the
19 Director determines there is a good cause for providing an
20 extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsec-
21 tion (c). After that date, the work and training components
22 of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by
23 section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Develop-
24 ment and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent

1 feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training
2 program, including funding through the prime sponsor
3 where appropriate.

4 “(c) The Director may provide financial assistance to
5 a public agency or private organization other than a prime
6 sponsor to carry out one or more component programs
7 described in subsection (a) when he determines, after solic-
8 iting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if
9 any, that such assistance would enhance program effective-
10 ness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would
11 serve the purposes of this title.

12 “SPECIAL CONDITIONS

13 “SEC. 124. (a) The Director shall not provide financial
14 assistance for any program under this part unless he deter-
15 mines, in accordance with such regulations as he may pre-
16 scribe, that—

17 “(1) no participant will be employed on projects
18 involving political parties, or the construction, opera-
19 tion, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is
20 used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place
21 for religious worship;

22 “(2) the program will not result in the displace-
23 ment of employed workers or impair existing contracts
24 for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for

1 other funds in connection with work that would other-
2 wise be performed;

3 “(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-
4 training and education, and other conditions of employ-
5 ment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light
6 of such factors as the type of work, geographical region,
7 and proficiency of the participant;

8 “(4) the program will, to the maximum extent
9 feasible, contribute to the occupational development or
10 upward mobility of individual participants.

11 “(b) For programs which provide work and training
12 related to physical improvements, preference shall be given
13 to those improvements which will be substantially used by
14 low-income persons and families or which will contribute
15 substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas
16 having high concentrations or proportions of low-income
17 persons and families.

18 “(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the
19 maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of
20 artificial barriers to employment and occupational advance-
21 ment.

22 “(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maxi-
23 mum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs
24 for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

1 “PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

2 “SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part
3 must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director,
4 in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall
5 establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration
6 family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and
7 other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be
8 from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare
9 payments.

10 “(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the
11 United States.

12 “(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal em-
13 ployees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law
14 relating to Federal employment, including those relating to
15 hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment
16 compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

17 “ELDERLY

18 “SEC. 126. The Director shall provide that programs
19 under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence
20 of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years
21 and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director
22 shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular,
23 part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

24 “PILOT PROJECTS

25 “SEC. 127. (a) The Director may provide financial
26 assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects

1 which are designed to develop new approaches to further the
2 objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by
3 public agencies or private organizations.

4 “(b) The Director shall undertake pilot projects de-
5 signed to encourage the maximum participation of private
6 employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and
7 training programs under this part.

8 “(c) Before the Director may approve a pilot project,
9 he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from
10 the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the
11 project will be undertaken.

12 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

13 “SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly or
14 through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) tech-
15 nical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective opera-
16 tion of programs under this part. He may also make arrange-
17 ments for the training of instructors and other personnel
18 needed to carry out work and training programs under this
19 part and part D of this title. He shall give special considera-
20 tion to the problems of rural areas.

21 “ROLE OF THE STATES

22 “SEC. 129. The Director may provide financial assistance
23 to appropriate State agencies to—

24 “(1) provide technical assistance and training, as
25 authorized by section 128, with particular emphasis upon

1 service to rural areas and for this purpose preference
2 shall be given to the State agency which administers
3 programs assisted by section 231;

4 “(2) assist in coordinating State activities related
5 to this part;

6 “(3) operate work and training programs in com-
7 munities which have not yet established an acceptable
8 prime sponsor; and

9 “(4) provide work and training opportunities on
10 State projects and in State agencies: *Provided*, That
11 these opportunities shall be made available to partici-
12 pants in community work and training programs.

13 “EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

14 “SEC. 130. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for
15 any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the
16 Director shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the
17 purpose of carrying out section 123 (a) (5) ; but not more
18 than $12\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal
19 year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the
20 remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the
21 provisions of section 123, the Director shall establish criteria
22 designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance
23 among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall con-
24 sider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population,
25 unemployment, and family income levels.

1 “LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

2 “SEC. 131. Federal financial assistance to any program
3 or activity carried out pursuant to section 123 of this part
4 shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program
5 or activity, including costs of administration. The Director
6 may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percent-
7 age if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing ob-
8 jective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary
9 in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal con-
10 tributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, includ-
11 ing but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in
12 any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contribu-
13 tions under this title exceeding its requirements under this
14 section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for
15 such contributions under section 224 (c) .

16 “PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

17 “SEC. 132. (a) The Director shall provide for the devel-
18 opment and implementation of a program data system con-
19 sistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal
20 programs. Such data shall be published periodically.

21 “(b) The Director shall provide for the continuing eval-
22 uation of the programs under this part, including their effec-
23 tiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related
24 programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the de-
25 livery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the

1 opinions of participants about the strengths and weak-
2 nesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include com-
3 parisons with proper control groups composed of persons
4 who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek
5 to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of
6 work and training programs authorized by this Act and by
7 other Acts, including the Manpower Development and
8 Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract
9 for independent evaluations of such programs or individual
10 projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included
11 in the report required by section 608.

12 “(c) The Director shall develop and publish standards
13 for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the
14 objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered
15 in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial as-
16 sistance provided by sections 123, 128, and 129.”

17 SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

18 SEC. 103. Part D of title I of the Economic Opportu-
19 nity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

20 “PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

21 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

22 “SEC. 150. The purpose of this part is to establish
23 special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of
24 the critical problems existing in particular communities or
25 neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other

1 subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas having
2 especially large concentrations of low-income persons, and
3 within those rural areas having substantial out-migration to
4 eligible urban areas, and (2) are of sufficient size and scope
5 to have an appreciable impact in such communities and
6 neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency,
7 chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions.

8 “ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS

9 “SEC. 151. The Director is authorized to provide finan-
10 cial assistance to public agencies or private organizations
11 for the payment of all or part of the costs of programs
12 which are designed to carry out the purposes of this part.
13 Such programs shall be restricted in number so that each
14 is of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact
15 on the area served. Such programs may include—

16 “(1) economic and business development pro-
17 grams, including programs which provide financial and
18 other incentives to business to locate in or near the areas
19 served so as to provide employment opportunities for
20 residents of those areas, and programs such as those
21 described in title IV of this Act for small businesses
22 in or owned by residents of such areas;

23 “(2) community development activities which
24 create new training and employment opportunities and

1 which contribute to an improved living environment;
2 and

3 “(3) manpower training programs for unemployed
4 or low-income persons which support and complement
5 economic, business, and community development pro-
6 grams, including without limitation activities such as
7 those described in part B of this title.

8 “REQUIREMENTS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

9 “SEC. 152. (a) The Director shall not provide finan-
10 cial assistance for any program or component project under
11 this part unless he determines that—

12 “(1) all projects and related facilities will, to the
13 maximum feasible extent, be located in the area served;

14 “(2) projects will, where feasible, promote the
15 development of entrepreneurial and management skills
16 and the ownership or participation in ownership of as-
17 sisted businesses by residents of the area served;

18 “(3) projects will be planned and carried out with
19 the maximum participation of local businessmen by their
20 inclusion on program boards of directors, advisory coun-
21 cils, or through other appropriate means;

22 “(4) the program will be appropriately coordinated
23 with local planning under this Act, the Demonstration
24 Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and
25 with other relevant plans for physical and human re-
26 sources of the areas served;

1 “(5) the requirements of subsections 122 (f) and
2 124 (a) of this Act have been met; and

3 “(6) preference will be given to the residents of
4 the areas served in filling jobs and training oppor-
5 tunities.

6 “(b) Financial assistance under this section shall not
7 be extended to assist in the relocation of establishments from
8 one location to another if such relocation would result in an
9 increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

10 “(c) The level of financial assistance for related pur-
11 poses under this Act to the area served by a special impact
12 program shall not be diminished in order to substitute funds
13 authorized by this part.

14 “(d) Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal
15 year for programs authorized under this title, the Director
16 shall reserve not less than 8 per centum for the purpose
17 of carrying out this part.

18 “APPLICATION OF OTHER FEDERAL RESOURCES

19 “SEC. 153. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban
20 Development shall, in consultation with the Director, take
21 all necessary steps under the authority granted to him under
22 title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to assure that land for
23 business location and expansion purposes is made available
24 as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this part.

25 “(b) Areas selected for assistance under this part shall

1 be deemed 'redevelopment areas' within the meaning of
2 section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Develop-
3 ment Act of 1965 and shall qualify for assistance under the
4 provisions of title II of that Act.

5 “(c) The Director shall take such steps as may be
6 necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation
7 with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so
8 that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Fed-
9 eral Government or in connection with programs aided with
10 Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the
11 purposes of this part.

12 “EVALUATION

13 “SEC. 154. Each program for which payments are made
14 under section 151 shall provide for a thorough evaluation
15 of the effectiveness of the program in achieving the goals of
16 this part. This evaluation shall be conducted by such public
17 or private organizations as the Director may designate, and
18 up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid
19 from funds appropriated to carry out this part. The results of
20 such evaluations or a summary of them, together with the
21 Director's findings and recommendations concerning the pro-
22 gram, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

23 “FEDERAL SHARE OF PROGRAM COSTS

24 “SEC. 155. Federal grants to any program carried out
25 pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the

1 cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless
 2 the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted
 3 and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for
 4 such determinations, that assistance in excess of such per-
 5 centage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this
 6 part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind,
 7 fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equip-
 8 ment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment
 9 is required under a contract with a private organization
 10 (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share
 11 thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital invest-
 12 ment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above.

13 COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

14 SEC. 104. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of
 15 1964 is amended to read as follows:

16 "TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY

17 ACTION PROGRAMS

18 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

19 "SEC. 201. The purpose of this title is to assist com-
 20 munities in opening opportunities which enable low-income
 21 persons to achieve self-sufficiency.

22 "COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

23 "SEC. 202. (a) To achieve this purpose, communities
 24 shall be encouraged and aided to plan and conduct com-
 25 munity action programs designed to—

1 “(1) provide services and assistance, including in-
2 novative approaches, which enable low-income persons
3 to achieve economic independence, to improve their
4 living conditions, and to increase their participation in
5 community activities;

6 “(2) stimulate agencies and institutions which pro-
7 vide services and assistance to low-income persons to
8 expand, modify, and improve their programs so as to
9 serve such persons more effectively; and

10 “(3) mobilize, utilize, and coordinate all relevant
11 public and private resources in a comprehensive program
12 which opens opportunities to low-income persons.

13 “(b) There shall be maximum feasible participation of
14 residents of the areas and members of the groups served in
15 the planning, conduct, administration, and evaluation of all
16 components of a community action program. There shall be
17 maximum emphasis upon local initiative and responsibility.

18 "PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND DELE-
19 GATE AGENCIES

20 "ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

21 “SEC. 210. The Director shall encourage the formation
22 of community action agencies. A community action agency
23 may be either a public or private nonprofit agency. It shall
24 be responsible for and must be capable of planning, conduct-
25 ing, administering, and evaluating a community action pro-

1 gram. It shall serve as the prime sponsor for all financial
2 assistance provided to its community under sections 220
3 and 221 (except as otherwise provided in sections 220 (c)
4 and 221 (a)). It shall have adequate authority (1) to
5 administer funds received under this title and from other
6 public and private sources, (2) to transfer and delegate such
7 funds to other agencies, and (3) to contract with public or
8 private organizations. It shall conform to such other criteria
9 as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions
10 of this title.

11 "COMMUNITIES

12 "SEC. 211. For the purpose of this title, a community
13 may be a city, county, multicity, or multicounty unit, an
14 Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irre-
15 spective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which pro-
16 vides a suitable organizational base and possesses the com-
17 monality of interest needed for a community action program.
18 The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal
19 agencies responsible for programs relating to work and train-
20 ing programs, physical and economic development, housing,
21 education, health, and other community services to encour-
22 age the establishment of coterminous or complementary
23 boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and
24 community action programs assisted under this title.

1 “STATEWIDE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

2 “SEC. 212. A statewide or regional agency may be a
3 community action agency for the purpose of planning, con-
4 ducting, administering and evaluating programs in a number
5 of rural areas or small communities until a satisfactory com-
6 munity agency is established. Such an agency must operate
7 in a manner consistent with sections 201 and 202, including
8 the participation and representation requirements of sec-
9 tion 213.

10 “GOVERNING BOARD

11 “SEC. 213. (a) A community action agency shall be
12 governed by a board which is broadly representative of the
13 community and which is organized to provide for the mem-
14 bership of both the public and private sectors.

15 (b) At least one-third of the membership of the board
16 shall be persons who are selected by residents of the areas
17 and members of the groups served. Each community action
18 agency shall establish procedures by which appropriate
19 representation is provided (1) to poor persons living in
20 neighborhoods where poverty is concentrated and (2) to
21 other poor persons including the elderly and rural residents
22 living outside these neighborhoods. All members of the gov-
23 erning board selected to represent specific geographic areas
24 must reside in the area they represent.

25 “(c) The Director shall require community action agen-

1 cies to establish procedures under which community agencies
2 and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves
3 inadequately represented on the governing board may peti-
4 tion for adequate representation.

5 “POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNING BOARD

6 “SEC. 214. (a) The governing board of a community
7 action agency shall be empowered to—

8 “(1) establish adequate personnel policies and fis-
9 cal controls;

10 “(2) approve overall plans, adopt and enforce pro-
11 gram policies, and approve all proposals for financial
12 assistance under this title; and

13 “(3) provide for periodic evaluation of the effective-
14 ness of the community action program and its com-
15 ponents.

16 “(b) Each community action agency shall provide for
17 reasonable public access to books, records and other informa-
18 tion and for opportunity for public hearing at the request of
19 local groups.

20 “DELEGATE AGENCIES

21 “SEC. 215. (a) Each community action agency shall be
22 encouraged to make use of delegate agencies to carry out
23 components of the community action program. Such agencies
24 shall consist of (1) neighborhood based organizations formed

1 to carry out programs under this Act, which shall be encour-
2 aged to have at least one-half of the governing board com-
3 posed of residents of the area or members of the groups
4 served, or (2) other delegate agencies which shall be re-
5 quired to establish effective procedures by which such persons
6 will be enabled to influence the character of programs affect-
7 ing their interests. A delegate agency may be a public
8 agency or private organization. Each delegate agency must
9 be capable of conducting the program or programs, shall
10 have adequate personnel policies and fiscal controls, shall
11 provide for reasonable public access to books, records, and
12 other information, and shall cooperate in the evaluation of
13 programs.

14 “(b) The community action agency shall encourage the
15 establishment of housing development and services organi-
16 zations designed to focus on the housing needs of low-income
17 families and individuals. Such organizations shall provide the
18 technical, administrative, and financial assistance which is
19 required to help low-income families and individuals more
20 effectively to utilize existing programs, and which is required
21 to enable nonprofit, cooperative, and public sponsors more
22 effectively to take advantage of existing Federal, State, and
23 local mortgage insurance and housing assistance programs.
24 Where appropriate, such organizations may be nonprofit
25 housing development corporations. Such corporations may

1 themselves become sponsors of housing under existing pro-
2 grams of specialized housing agencies, but under no circum-
3 stances shall such corporations insure mortgages or duplicate
4 the long-term capital financing functions of programs now
5 administered by the specialized housing agencies. Housing
6 development and service organizations shall coordinate their
7 efforts with other community action agency efforts so that
8 any programs undertaken under authority of this subsection
9 shall be closely related to other community action programs.

10 “PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY
11 ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

12 “GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

13 “SEC. 220. (a) The Director may provide financial as-
14 sistance to community action agencies for the planning, con-
15 duct, administration and evaluation of community action
16 programs and components. Those components may involve
17 national emphasis program activities as described in section
18 221 and, without limitation, other activities and supporting
19 facilities designed to assist participants including the elderly
20 poor—

21 “(1) to secure and retain meaningful employment;

22 “(2) to attain an adequate education;

23 “(3) to make better use of available income;

24 “(4) to provide and maintain adequate housing and

25 a suitable living environment;

1 “(5) to undertake family planning, consistent
2 with personal and family goals, religious and moral
3 convictions;

4 “(6) to obtain services for the prevention of
5 narcotics addiction, alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of
6 narcotic addicts and alcoholics;

7 “(7) to obtain emergency assistance through loans
8 or grants to meet immediate and urgent individual and
9 family needs, including the need for health services,
10 nutritious food, housing, and employment-related as-
11 sistance;

12 “(8) to remove obstacles and solve personal and
13 family problems which block the achievement of self-
14 sufficiency;

15 “(9) to achieve greater participation in the affairs
16 of the community; and

17 “(10) to make more frequent and effective use of
18 other programs related to the purposes of this title.

19 He may also provide financial assistance to other public or
20 private non-profit agencies to aid them in planning for the
21 establishment of a community action agency.

22 “(b) After July 1, 1968, the Director shall require, as
23 a condition of assistance, that each community action agency
24 has adopted a systematic approach to the achievement of
25 the purposes of this title and to the utilization of funds pro-

1 vided under this part. Such systematic approach shall en-
2 compass a planning and implementation process which seeks
3 to identify the problems and causes of poverty in the com-
4 munity, seeks to mobilize and coordinate relevant public and
5 private resources, establishes program priorities, links pro-
6 gram components with one another and with other relevant
7 programs, and provides for evaluation. The Director may,
8 however, extend the time for such requirement to take into
9 account the length of time a program has been in operation.
10 He shall also take necessary steps to assure the participation
11 of other Federal agencies in support of the development and
12 implementation of plans under this subsection.

13 “(c) The Director may and is encouraged to provide
14 financial assistance to a public agency or private organization
15 other than a community action agency to carry out one or
16 more component programs under this section and section 221
17 when he determines, after soliciting and considering com-
18 ments of the community action agency, if any, that such
19 assistance would enhance program participation or accept-
20 ance on the part of persons served and would serve the pur-
21 poses of this title.

22 “(d) At least 50 per centum of the funds authorized
23 and appropriated for this title shall be utilized to finance
24 component programs under this section and section 221

1 which are locally selected to respond to particular com-
2 munity needs.

3 “(e) In order to promote local responsibility and ini-
4 tiative, the Director shall not establish binding national
5 priorities on funds authorized by this section, but he shall re-
6 view each application for financial assistance on its merits.
7 Before extending financial assistance to a new community
8 action agency under this section and under section 221, and
9 in determining the amount of and conditions on which such
10 assistance shall be extended, the Director shall consider the
11 extent and nature of poverty in the community and the
12 probable capacity of the agency to carry out an effective
13 program. In reviewing or supplementing financial assistance
14 to a previously existing community action agency, he shall
15 consider the progress made in carrying on programs by such
16 agency.

17 “NATIONAL EMPHASIS PROGRAMS

18 “SEC. 221. (a) The Director may reserve funds and
19 provide financial assistance for national emphasis programs
20 designed to deal with needs of the poor which are common
21 to a number of communities. Except as otherwise provided
22 in subsection (b) (5) and section 220(c), such financial
23 assistance shall be provided through community action agen-
24 cies, unless (1) the community action agency chooses not
25 to undertake that responsibility, or (2) the community

1 action agency fails to demonstrate affirmatively its capability
2 to undertake this responsibility, or (3) there is no com-
3 munity action agency in the area. Community action agencies
4 shall be encouraged to make maximum use of delegate agen-
5 cies to operate such programs.

6 “(b) Among the national emphasis programs shall be
7 the following:

8 “(1) A program to be known as Headstart focused
9 upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory
10 school attendance which will provide such comprehensive
11 health, nutritional, education, social, and other services, as
12 the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full
13 potential, together with appropriate activities to encourage
14 the participation of parents of such children and permit the
15 effective use of parent services.

16 “(2) A program to be known as Follow Through
17 focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or ele-
18 mentary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart
19 or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive
20 services and parent participation activities as described in
21 paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the con-
22 tinued development of children to their full potential.

23 “(3) A ‘legal services program’ to further the cause of
24 justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the

1 assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing
2 legal advice, legal representation, counseling education, and
3 other appropriate services. Projects involving legal advice
4 and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures
5 maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with
6 the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall
7 establish procedures to assure that the principal local bar
8 associations in the area to be served by any proposed project
9 for legal advice and representation are afforded an adequate
10 opportunity to submit comments and recommendations on
11 the proposal before it is approved or funded.

12 “(4) A ‘comprehensive health services program’. This
13 shall include—

14 “(A) programs to aid in developing and carrying
15 out comprehensive health services projects focused upon
16 the needs of urban and rural areas having high concen-
17 trations or proportions of poverty and marked inade-
18 quacy of health services for the poor. These projects
19 shall be designed—

20 “(i) to make possible, with maximum feasible
21 use of existing agencies and resources, the provision
22 of comprehensive health services, such as preventive
23 medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, family
24 planning, narcotic addiction and alcoholism pre-
25 vention and rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and

1 followup services, together with necessary related
2 facilities and services; and

3 “(ii) to assure that these services are made
4 readily accessible to low-income residents of such
5 areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to
6 their needs and with their participation and wherever
7 possible are combined with, or included within, ar-
8 rangements for providing employment, education,
9 social, or other assistance needed by the families
10 and individuals served: *Provided, however, That*
11 such services may be made available on an emer-
12 gency basis or pending a determination of eligibility
13 to all residents of such areas.

14 Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall
15 be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants
16 to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and
17 may be used, as necessary to pay the full costs of projects.
18 Before approving any project, the Director shall solicit
19 and consider the comments and recommendations of the
20 principal local medical associations in the area and shall
21 consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health
22 agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure
23 that the program will be carried on under competent
24 professional supervision and that existing agencies pro-
25 viding related services are furnished all assistance needed

1 to permit them to plan for participation in the program
2 and for the necessary continuation of those related serv-
3 ices; and

4 “(B) programs to provide financial assistance to
5 public or private agencies for projects designed to de-
6 velop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health
7 services for the poor. Such projects shall encourage both
8 prospective and practicing health professionals to direct
9 their talents and energies toward providing health serv-
10 ices for the poor. In carrying out the provisions of this
11 paragraph, the Director is authorized to provide or ar-
12 range for training and study in the field of health serv-
13 ices for the poor. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by
14 him, the Director may arrange for the payment of
15 stipends and allowances (including travel and subsist-
16 ence expenses) for persons undergoing such training
17 and study and for their dependents. The Director and
18 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall
19 achieve effective coordination of programs and projects
20 authorized under this section with other related
21 activities.

22 “(5) A program to be known as Upward Bound de-
23 signed to generate skills and motivation necessary for suc-
24 cess in education beyond high school among young people
25 from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary

1 school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to
2 assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher
3 education and one or more secondary schools. They must in-
4 clude a curriculum designed to develop creative thinking,
5 effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for
6 post-secondary educational success, necessary health services
7 and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the
8 Director determines may be appropriate. Financial assist-
9 ance for such projects may be provided directly to institu-
10 tions of higher learning, but the projects shall be closely
11 coordinated with activities of community action agencies
12 and with the Higher Education Act of 1965.

13 “(6) A program to be known as Project Find designed
14 to identify and meet the needs of poor persons above the
15 age of 60 in one or more of the following areas: effective
16 referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing,
17 legal and consumer assistance, recreation, and other services;
18 stimulation of additional services and programs to remedy
19 gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and pro-
20 grams; provision of new employment and volunteer op-
21 portunities; increased participation in community activities
22 and programs; modification of existing procedures and eligi-
23 bility requirements to facilitate greater use of and participa-
24 tion in public services by the older poor; development of
25 all-season recreation centers; and such other activities and

1 services as the Director may determine are necessary or
2 specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor.

3 “(7) A ‘family planning program’ to provide assist-
4 ance and services to low-income persons in the field of vol-
5 untary family planning, including the provision of infor-
6 mation, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and
7 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall co-
8 ordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concern-
9 ing, family planning projects within their respective juris-
10 dictions in order to assure the maximum availability of
11 services and in order best to meet the varying needs of dif-
12 ferent communities. The Secretary of Health, Education,
13 and Welfare shall make the services of Public Health
14 Services officers available to the Director in carrying out this
15 program.

16 “(c) Consistent with, and subject, to the provisions of
17 section 232, programs under this section may include related
18 training, research, and technical assistance, and funds allo-
19 cated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the
20 manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to
21 training, research, and technical assistance activities.

22 “RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT

23 “SEC. 222. In the conduct of all component programs
24 under this part, residents of the area and members of the
25 groups served shall be provided maximum employment op-

1 portunity, including opportunity for further occupational
2 training and career advancement. The Director shall encour-
3 age the employment of persons fifty-five years and older as
4 regular, part-time and short-term staff in component
5 programs.

6 "NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

7 "SEC. 223. The Director shall encourage the develop-
8 ment of neighborhood centers, designed to promote the effec-
9 tiveness of needed services in such fields as health, educa-
10 tion, manpower, consumer protection, child and economic
11 development, housing, legal, recreation, and social services,
12 and so organized (through a corporate or other appropriate
13 framework) as to promote maximum participation of neigh-
14 borhood residents in center planning, policymaking, adminis-
15 tration, and operation. In addition to providing such services
16 as may not otherwise be conveniently or readily available,
17 such centers shall be responsive to such neighborhood needs
18 as counseling, referral, follow-through, and community devel-
19 opment activities as may be necessary or appropriate to best
20 assure a system under which existing programs are extended
21 to the most disadvantaged, are linked to one another, are
22 responsive and relevant to the range of community, family,
23 and individual problems and are fully adapted to neighbor-
24 hood needs and conditions.

1 “ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

2 “SEC. 224. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or
3 allocated for assistance in the development and implementa-
4 tion of community action programs pursuant to section 220
5 and for national emphasis programs referred to in section
6 221 (a), and which are not subject to any other provision
7 governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot
8 not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam,
9 American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,
10 and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs.
11 He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of those
12 sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and
13 procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be
14 allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest
15 available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on
16 the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance
17 recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the
18 average number of unemployed persons in each State as
19 compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of
20 related children living with families with incomes of less
21 than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That
22 part of any State allotment which the Director determines
23 will not be needed may be reallocated, on such dates during
24 the fiscal year as the Director may fix, to other States, in
25 proportion to their original allotments, but with appropriate

1 adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to
2 any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among
3 the other States.

4 “(b) The Director may provide for the separate allot-
5 ment of funds for any national emphasis program referred to
6 in section 221 (a) except Headstart. This allotment may be
7 made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsec-
8 tion (a), or it may be made in accordance with criteria
9 which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of
10 funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the
11 needs or problems at which the program is directed, except
12 that in no event may more than $12\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the funds
13 for any one program be used in any one State.

14 “(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial
15 assistance extended to a community action agency or other
16 agency pursuant to sections 220 and 221 shall not exceed
17 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted pro-
18 grams or activities. The Director may, however, approve
19 assistance in excess of such percentage if he determines, in
20 accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria,
21 that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes
22 of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in
23 kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant,
24 equipment, or services. If in any fiscal year, a community
25 provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceed-

1 ing its requirements under this section, such excess may be
2 used to meet its requirements for such contributions under
3 section 131.

4 “(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under
5 sections 220 and 221, unless the Director satisfies himself
6 (1) that the services to be provided under such program
7 will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services
8 previously provided without Federal assistance, (2) that,
9 to the extent that in-school educational services previously
10 provided with or without Federal assistance can be expanded
11 and adapted to meet more effectively (A) the needs of the
12 poor within the community and (B) the purposes of the
13 assistance to be extended under this title, the agency provid-
14 ing such services shall be utilized, and (3) that funds or
15 other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the
16 needs of the poor within the community will not be di-
17 minished in order to provide any contributions required
18 under subsection (c) or otherwise qualify for assistance
19 under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding
20 sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director
21 may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for
22 determinations covering situations where a strict applica-
23 tion of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship
24 or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be
25 achieved.

1 “PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

2 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

3 “SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or
4 through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assist-
5 ance to communities in planning, conducting, administering,
6 and evaluating programs under this title, and (2) training
7 of specialized or other personnel which are needed to achieve
8 the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiv-
9 ing financial assistance under this title, the Director may
10 make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist
11 and advise it in the performance of functions related to the
12 assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for
13 a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

14 “STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE—SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO

15 GOVERNORS

16 “SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial as-
17 sistance to appropriate State agencies to enable those
18 agencies—

19 “(1) to provide technical assistance to communi-
20 ties and local agencies in developing and carrying out
21 programs under this title;

22 “(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related
23 to this title;

24 “(3) to advise and assist the Director in develop-

1 ing procedures and programs to promote the participa-
2 tion of States and State agencies in programs under this
3 title; and

4 “(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Eco-
5 nomic Opportunity Council established by section 631
6 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in
7 identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or ad-
8 ministrative requirements that operate to impede State
9 level coordination of programs related to this title, and
10 in developing methods or recommendations for overcom-
11 ing those problems.

12 “(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the
13 Director shall give preference to programs or activities which
14 are administered or coordinated by the agencies assisted pur-
15 suant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and
16 will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

17 “(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of
18 funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State
19 agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States
20 or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of
21 the United States for purposes of providing financial assist-
22 ance to community action agencies or other local agencies
23 in connection with specific projects or types of projects in-
24 volving the common or joint use of State funds and funds
25 under this title.

1 “(d) In carrying out the provisions of part B of title I
2 and title II no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other as-
3 sistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local
4 public agency or any private institution or organization for
5 the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other ac-
6 tivity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed
7 contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been
8 submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has
9 not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of
10 such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered
11 by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with
12 the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this part.
13 This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agree-
14 ments, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of
15 higher education in existence on the date of the approval of
16 this Act.

17 “RESEARCH AND PILOT PROJECTS

18 “SEC. 232. (a) The Director may provide financial
19 assistance for pilot projects conducted by public agencies or
20 private organizations which are designed to assist in the
21 development of new approaches that will aid in furthering
22 the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide
23 financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes
24 of this title.

25 “(b) Before approving any contract or grant for a pilot

1 project in a community which has a community action
2 agency, the Director shall solicit and consider the views of
3 that agency on the proposed project.

4 “(c) The Director shall develop and carry out pilot
5 projects (1) which aid elderly persons to achieve greater
6 self-sufficiency, (2) which focus upon the problems of rural
7 poverty, (3) which are designed to develop new techniques
8 and community-based efforts to prevent narcotics addiction
9 or to rehabilitate narcotic addicts, and (4) which are de-
10 signed to encourage the participation of private organizations,
11 other than nonprofit organizations, in programs under this
12 title.

13 “(d) The Director shall establish an overall plan to gov-
14 ern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the
15 use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall
16 set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities
17 among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director
18 shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of
19 minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects
20 and determining whether the findings resulting from any re-
21 search or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more
22 programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part
23 of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate
24 annual report, the Director shall submit a description for
25 each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section,

1 of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived
2 from those activities, together with a statement indicating the
3 time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the
4 benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be
5 realized.

6 “(e) Not more than 10 per centum of the sums appro-
7 priated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be
8 used for the purposes of this section.

9 “EVALUATION

10 “SEC. 233. (a) The Director shall provide for the con-
11 tinuing evaluation of programs under this part, including their
12 effectiveness in achieving stated goals their impact on re-
13 lated programs and their structure and mechanism for the
14 delivery of services and including, where appropriate, com-
15 parisons with proper control groups composed of persons
16 who have not participated in such programs. He may, for
17 this purpose contract for independent evaluations of those
18 programs or individual projects. He shall also arrange for
19 obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths
20 and weaknesses of the programs. The results of such evalua-
21 tion shall be included in the report required by section 608.

22 “(b) The Director shall develop and publish standards
23 for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the
24 objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered

1 in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assist-
2 ance provided by sections 220, 221, 230, and 231.

3 "PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS—

4 "RURAL AREAS

5 "SEC. 240. (a) The Director shall establish criteria de-
6 signed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under
7 this title within the States between urban and rural areas.
8 In developing such criteria, he shall consider the relative
9 number in the States or areas therein of: (1) low-income
10 families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed
11 persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on
12 a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations;
13 (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-
14 grade education; (6) persons rejected for military service:
15 and (7) persons living in urban places compared to the
16 number living in rural places as determined by the latest
17 reports of the Bureau of the Census.

18 "(b) To assure that rural areas are able to utilize their
19 full and equitable share of assistance, the Director shall un-
20 dertake special efforts to increase the effectiveness of rural
21 community action programs. He shall describe these efforts
22 and their results in the report required by section 608.

23 "FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

24 "SEC. 241. The Director shall prescribe regulations to
25 assure that programs under this title are carried on subject

1 to adequate internal controls, accounting requirements, and
2 rules governing personnel standards and policies as may be
3 necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency and the effec-
4 tive use of funds. These regulations shall include provisions
5 governing matters relating to partisan political activities and
6 elections referred to in section 603 (b) of this Act.

7 "AUDITS

8 "SEC. 242. (a) Within three months after the effective
9 date of the first grant or contract of assistance with an or-
10 ganization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be
11 made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the
12 adequacy of the accounting system and internal manage-
13 ment controls.

14 "(b) At least once annually the Director shall make or
15 cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assist-
16 ance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such
17 audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings
18 and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures in-
19 curred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the
20 Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appro-
21 priate means, including court action or a commensurate in-
22 crease in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any
23 grant or contract with the same agency or organization
24 which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve
25 months after the date of disallowance.

1 "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

2 "SEC. 243. The following special limitations shall apply,
3 as indicated, to programs under this title.

4 " (1) Financial assistance under this title may in-
5 clude funds to provide a reasonable allowance for at-
6 tendance at meetings of any community action agency
7 governing board, neighborhood council or committee,
8 as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum
9 feasible participation of members of groups and residents
10 of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this
11 title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses
12 connected with those meetings; but those funds (or
13 matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay
14 allowances in the case of any individual who is a Fed-
15 eral, State, or local government employee, or an em-
16 ployee of a community action agency, or for payment of
17 an allowance to any individual for attendance at more
18 than two meetings a month.

19 " (2) No officer or employee of the Office of Eco-
20 nomic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board,
21 council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee,
22 contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a pro-
23 gram receiving financial assistance under this title; but
24 this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serv-
25 ing on a board, council, or committee which does not

1 have any authority or powers in connection with a pro-
2 gram assisted under this title.

3 “(3) In granting financial assistance for projects
4 or activities in the field of family planning, the Director
5 shall assure that family planning services, including the
6 dissemination of family planning information and medi-
7 cal assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-
8 income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility
9 for assistance under this part which have been estab-
10 lished by the assisted agency and who desire such in-
11 formation, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall re-
12 quire, in connection with any such financial assistance,
13 that—

14 “(A) no individual will be provided with any
15 information, medical supervision, or supplies which
16 that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or
17 her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

18 “(B) no individual will be provided with any
19 medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has
20 voluntarily requested such medical supervision or
21 supplies.

22 The use of family planning services assisted under this
23 title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services
24 from or participation in any other programs under this
25 Act.

1 “(4) No financial assistance shall be extended un-
2 der this title to provide general or curricular aid to edu-
3 cation in any school or school system other than for spe-
4 cial health, welfare, remedial, and other noncurricular
5 services designed to encourage successful participation in
6 school.

7 “(5) In extending assistance under this title the
8 Director shall give special consideration to programs
9 which make maximum use of existing schools, com-
10 munity centers, settlement houses, and other facilities
11 during times they are not in use for their primary
12 purpose.

13 “(6) In extending assistance under this title for
14 supplemental educational services of the type not pro-
15 hibited by paragraph (4) of this section, the Director
16 shall make maximum use of the services of the Commis-
17 sioner of Education, and of State and local educational
18 agencies.

19 **“DURATION OF PROGRAM**

20 “SEC. 244. The Director shall carry out the programs
21 provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June
22 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each
23 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the
24 Congress may authorize by law.”

1 **AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS**

2 SEC. 105. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity
3 Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately un-
4 der the title heading a new part heading to read “PART A—
5 RURAL LOAN PROGRAM”, and (2) striking out the heading
6 immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof
7 a new heading to read “LOANS TO FAMILIES”.

8 (b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as
9 follows:

10 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

11 “SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some
12 of the special needs of low-income rural families by estab-
13 lishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintain-
14 ing their income and living standards.”

15 (c) Section 302 (a) of such Act is amended by insert-
16 ing the word “principal” after the word “aggregate”.

17 (d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI
18 thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as
19 section 306, and amended by striking out “titles III of this
20 Act” in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu
21 thereof “this part”.

22 (e) Part B of title III of such Act is amended to read
23 as follows:

1 "PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEA-
2 SONALLY EMPLOYED, FARMWORKERS AND THEIR
3 FAMILIES

4 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

5 "SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to assist migrant
6 and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve
7 their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a
8 productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly com-
9 plex and technological society.

10 "FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

11 "SEC. 312. (a) The Director may provide financial as-
12 sistance to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit
13 institutions and cooperatives in developing and carrying out
14 programs to fulfill the purpose of this part.

15 "(b) Programs assisted under this part may include
16 projects or activities—

17 "(1) to meet the immediate needs of migrant and
18 seasonal farmworkers and their families, such as day
19 care for children, education, health services, improved
20 housing and sanitation (including the provision and
21 maintenance of emergency and temporary housing and
22 sanitation facilities), legal advice and representation,
23 and consumer training and counseling;

24 "(2) to promote increased community acceptance
25 of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families;
26 and

1 “(3) to equip unskilled migrant and seasonal farm-
2 workers and members of their families as appropriate
3 through education and training to meet the changing
4 demands in agricultural employment brought about by
5 technological advancement and to take advantage of
6 opportunities available to improve their well-being and
7 self-sufficiency by gaining regular or permanent em-
8 ployment or by participating in available Government
9 training programs.

10 “LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

11 “SEC. 313. (a) Assistance shall not be extended under
12 this part unless the Director determines that the applicant
13 will maintain its prior level of effort in similar activities.

14 “(b) The Director shall establish necessary procedures
15 or requirements to assure that programs under this part are
16 carried on in coordination with other programs or activities
17 providing assistance to the persons and groups served.

18 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION

19 “SEC. 314. (a) The Director may provide directly or
20 through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, such tech-
21 nical assistance or training of personnel as may be required
22 to implement effectively the purposes of this title.

23 “(b) The Director shall provide for necessary evalua-
24 tion of projects under this title and may, through grants or
25 contracts, secure independent evaluation for this purpose.

1 The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall
2 be summarized in the report required by section 608.”

3 AMENDMENT TO PART D OF TITLE III—INDEMNITY

4 PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

5 SEC. 106. Section 331 (c) of the Economic Opportunity
6 Act is amended by striking out “1967.” and inserting in
7 lieu thereof “1968.”.

8 AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND

9 INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

10 SEC. 107. (a) Section 401 of the Economic Opportu-
11 nity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “enterprises;”
12 and inserting in lieu thereof “enterprises, with special atten-
13 tion to small business concerns (1) located in urban areas of
14 high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals
15 or (2) owned by low-income individuals;”.

16 (b) Section 402 (a) of such Act is amended by—

17 (1) striking out “employment of the long-term
18 unemployed” in the first sentence and inserting in lieu
19 thereof “the preservation or establishment of small busi-
20 ness concerns located in urban areas of high concentra-
21 tion of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned
22 by low-income individuals”;

23 (2) striking out the period at the end of the next
24 to last sentence and inserting, in lieu thereof, a colon;
25 and

(3) inserting immediately preceding the last sentence, “*Provided, however, That any management training program so approved must be of sufficient scope and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for the individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency.*”.

(c) Section 402 of such Act is amended by striking out the first subsection (b).

(d) Title IV of such Act is amended by—

(1) renumbering section 405 to read “407” and inserting in such subsection “and the Secretary of Commerce” immediately following the word “Administration”;

(2) striking out section 404; and

(3) inserting new sections 404, 405, and 406 to read as follows:

“DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

“SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to this part are allotted to small business concerns located in urban areas identified by the Director as having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Ad-

1 ministrator of the Small Business Administration and the
2 Director shall jointly define the meaning of low income as
3 it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to
4 be assisted under this part, and such definition need not
5 correspond to the definition of low income as used else-
6 where in this Act.

7 “LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

8 “SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended
9 pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small
10 Business Administration or the Secretary of Commerce de-
11 termines that the assistance will be used in relocating es-
12 tablishments from one area to another if such relocation
13 would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of
14 original location.

15 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

16 “SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is author-
17 ized to provide financial assistance to public or private orga-
18 nizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed
19 to provide technical and management assistance to individu-
20 als or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402,
21 with special attention to small business concerns located
22 in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-
23 income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.

24 “(b) Financial assistance under this section may be
25 provided for projects, including without limitation—

1 “(1) planning and research, including feasibility
2 studies and market research;

3 “(2) the identification and development of new
4 business opportunities, and the stimulation of new pri-
5 vate capital resources through the use of guarantees,
6 pooling arrangements, or otherwise;

7 “(3) the furnishing of centralized services with
8 regard to public services and government programs,
9 including programs authorized under section 402;

10 “(4) the establishment and strengthening of busi-
11 ness service agencies, including trade associations and
12 cooperatives;

13 “(5) the encouragement of the placement of sub-
14 contracts by major businesses with small business con-
15 cerns located in urban areas of high concentration of
16 unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-
17 income individuals, including the provision of incen-
18 tives and assistance to such major businesses so that they
19 will aid in the training and upgrading of potential sub-
20 contractors or other small business concerns; and

21 “(6) the furnishing of business counseling, man-
22 agement training, and legal and other related services,
23 with special emphasis on the development of manage-
24 ment training programs using the resources of the busi-

1 ness community, including the development of manage-
2 ment training opportunities in existing businesses, and
3 with emphasis in all cases upon providing management
4 training of sufficient scope and duration to develop en-
5 trepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the
6 part of the individuals served.

7 “(c) The Secretary of Commerce shall give preference
8 to projects which promote the ownership, participation in
9 ownership, or management of small business concerns by
10 residents of urban areas of high concentration of unem-
11 ployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are
12 planned and carried out with the participation of local
13 businessmen.

14 “(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section
15 shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to
16 the individuals and small business concerns served.

17 “(e) The Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps
18 as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and
19 cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments
20 and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits
21 made by the Federal Government or in connection with pro-
22 grams aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way
23 as to further the purposes of this title.

24 “(f) The Secretary of Commerce shall provide for the
25 continuing evaluation of programs under this section and the

1 results of such evaluation together with recommendations
2 shall be included in the report required by section 608.”

3 DAY CARE PROJECTS

4 SEC. 108. (a) Title V of the Economic Opportunity
5 Act of 1964 is amended by adding the following new part
6 at the end thereof:

7 “PART B—DAY CARE PROJECTS

8 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

9 “SEC. 521. The purpose of this part is to provide day
10 care for children from low-income families or from urban
11 and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions
12 of low-income persons in order to enable the parents or
13 relatives of such children to choose to undertake or to con-
14 tinue vocational training, basic education, or gainful employ-
15 ment.

16 “GRANTS FOR DAY CARE PROJECTS

17 “SEC. 522. (a) The Director is authorized to make
18 grants to appropriate public agencies and private orga-
19 nizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost
20 of projects under which children from low-income families
21 or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or
22 proportions of low-income persons may receive day care.
23 Such day care projects shall provide health, education,
24 social and such other supportive services as may be needed.
25 Project costs payable under this part may include costs

1 of renovation and alteration of physical facilities. Financial
2 assistance under this section may be provided in conjunction
3 with or to supplement day care projects under the Social
4 Security Act or other relevant statutes.

5 “(b) The Director may require a family which is not
6 a low-income family to make payment, in whole or in
7 part, for the day care services provided under this program
8 where the family’s financial condition is, or becomes through
9 employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment
10 appropriate.

11 “(c) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the
12 Director shall give preference to projects providing day
13 care for children from low-income families or from urban
14 and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of
15 low-income persons whose parents or relatives desire to
16 accept employment or to undertake vocational training or
17 basic education under this and other Acts.

18 “(d) The Director and the Secretary of Health, Edu-
19 cation, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordi-
20 nate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day
21 care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a com-
22 mon set of program standards and regulations, and mecha-
23 nisms for coordination at the State and local levels. The
24 Director shall give preference to applicants which show evi-
25 dence of coordination and cooperation between their projects

1 and other day care programs in the areas which they will
2 serve.

3 “(e) Each project to which payments are made here-
4 under shall provide for a thorough evaluation. This evalua-
5 tion shall be conducted by such agency or independent pub-
6 lic or private organization as the Director shall designate,
7 with a view to determining, among other things, the extent
8 to which the day care provided may have increased the em-
9 ployment of parents and relatives of the children served,
10 the extent to which such day care may have reduced the
11 costs of aid and services to such children, the extent to which
12 such children have received health and educational bene-
13 fits, and the extent to which the project has been coordi-
14 nated with other day care activities in the area served. Up
15 to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid
16 by the Director from funds appropriated for the purposes
17 of carrying out this part. Such evaluations, together with a
18 report on the program described in this part, shall be in-
19 cluded in the report required by section 608.

20 “TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

21 RECIPIENTS IN DAY CARE PROJECTS

22 “SEC. 523. (a) The Director, the Secretary of Labor,
23 and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall
24 take all necessary steps in the operation of vocational train-
25 ing, work experience, and basic education programs under

1 their jurisdiction to train unemployed or low-income indi-
 2 viduals in day care projects under this part.

3 “(b) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the
 4 Director shall give preference to projects in which unem-
 5 ployed or low-income individuals are to be employed includ-
 6 ing individuals receiving or eligible to receive assistance
 7 under the Social Security Act.

8 “DURATION OF PROGRAMS

9 “SEC. 524. The Director shall carry out the programs
 10 provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June
 11 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years.”

12 (b) The heading of title V of the Economic Opportunity
 13 Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

14 “TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND
 15 DAY CARE PROGRAMS”

16 (c) Title V of such Act is further amended by insert-
 17 ing after the heading thereof the following:

18 “PART A—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS”

19 (d) Sections 501, 502, 503, 504, and 505 of such Act
 20 are amended by striking out “this title” wherever it appears
 21 therein and inserting in lieu thereof “this part”.

22 ADMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND
 23 COORDINATION

24 SEC. 109. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Economic Oppor-
 25 tunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “four” in
 26 the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof “five”.

1 (b) Section 604 of such Act is amended to read as
2 follows:

3 "APPEALS, NOTICE AND HEARING

4 "SEC. 604. The Director shall prescribe procedures to
5 assure that—

6 "(1) special notice of and an opportunity for a
7 timely and expeditious appeal to the Director is provided
8 for an agency or organization which would like to serve
9 as a delegate agency under title I-B or II and whose
10 application to the prime sponsor or community action
11 agency has been wholly or substantially rejected or
12 has not been acted upon within a period of time deemed
13 reasonable by the Director;

14 "(2) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and
15 III-B shall not be suspended for failure to comply with
16 applicable terms and conditions, except in emergency
17 situations, nor shall an application for refunding under
18 sections 123, 220, 221, or 312 be denied, unless the
19 recipient agency has been given reasonable notice and
20 opportunity to show cause why such action should not
21 be taken; and

22 "(3) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and
23 III-B shall not be terminated for failure to comply with
24 applicable terms and conditions unless the recipient
25 agency has been afforded reasonable notice and oppor-
26 tunity for a full and fair hearing."

1 (c) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as
2 follows:

3 “DEFINITIONS

4 “SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

5 “(1) the term ‘State’ means a State, the Com-
6 monwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia,
7 Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for
8 purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning
9 of ‘State’ shall also include the Trust Territory of the
10 Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 224
11 of this Act this term means only a State or the District
12 of Columbia. The term ‘United States’ when used in
13 a geographical sense includes all those places named in
14 the previous sentence, and all other places continental
15 or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United
16 States;

17 “(2) the term ‘financial assistance’ when used in
18 titles, I, II, III-B, IV, and V-B includes assistance
19 advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does
20 not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or
21 goods or services; and

22 “(3) the term ‘permanent resident of the United
23 States’ when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any
24 native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United
25 States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee sub-

sequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of sections 214 (a) or 212 (d) (5), respectively, or any person admitted as a conditional entrant under section 203 (a) (7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act.”

(d) Section 610 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

“PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

“SEC. 610. It is the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this Act. The Director shall (1) carry out such investigations and studies, including consultations with appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary to develop and carry out a plan for the participation of the elderly poor in programs under this Act, including programs providing employment opportunities, public service opportunities, education and other services and activities which assist the elderly poor to achieve self-sufficiency; (2) maintain a constant review of all programs under this Act to assure that the needs of the elderly poor are given adequate consideration; (3) initiate and maintain interagency liaison with all other appropriate Federal agencies to achieve a coordinated national approach to the needs of the elderly poor; and (4) determine and recommend to the President and the Congress such programs requiring additional authority and

1 the necessary legislation to provide such authority. The
2 Director shall describe the ways in which this section has
3 been implemented in the annual report required by section
4 608.”

5 (e) Section 610-1 of such Act is renumbered section
6 611 and subsection (a) of such section is amended by insert-
7 ing the words “a substantial number of the” immediately
8 before the word “persons” the second and third time that
9 word appears.

10 (f) Section 612 of such Act is amended to read as
11 follows:

12 “JOINT FUNDING

13 “SEC. 612. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the
14 President, where funds are advanced for a single project by
15 more than one Federal agency to a community action agency
16 or other agency assisted under this Act, any one Federal
17 agency may be designated to act for all in administering the
18 funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share require-
19 ment may be established according to the proportion of funds
20 advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive
21 any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by
22 such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar re-
23 quirements of the administering agency or which the admin-
24 istering agency does not impose.

1 (g) Section 616 of such Act is amended to read as
2 follows:

3 "TRANSFER OF FUNDS

4 "SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appro-
5 priations for any program or activity under this Act or any
6 Act authorizing appropriations for such program or activity,
7 not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or
8 allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling
9 the Director to carry out any such program or activity under
10 the Act may be transferred and used by the Director for the
11 purpose of carrying out any other such program or activity
12 under the Act; but no such transfer shall result in increasing
13 the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity
14 by more than 10 per centum."

15 (h) Title VI of such Act is amended by—

16 (1) striking out the heading "PART B—COORDI-
17 NATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS" and sections
18 611, 613, and 614; and

19 (2) inserting at the end thereof a new part B to
20 read as follows:

21 "PART B—COORDINATION

22 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

23 "SEC. 630. This part establishes an Economic Oppor-
24 tunity Council, provides for an information center, and pre-

1 scribes certain duties and responsibilities. Its purpose is to
2 promote better coordination among all programs related to
3 this Act, with a view to making those programs more effec-
4 tive in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State and
5 local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to varying
6 local problems and conditions, stimulating new and more
7 imaginative ways of combining complementary Federal re-
8 sources in the solution of specific problems, and generally
9 improving cooperation and communication among all levels
10 of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related
11 to the purposes of this Act.

12 "ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

13 "SEC. 631. (a) There is established, in the Executive
14 Office of the President, the Economic Opportunity Council
15 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council'), which shall be
16 composed of the Director and the heads of such Federal
17 departments and agencies, such Presidential assistants and
18 such other officials of the Federal Government as the Presi-
19 dent may from time to time designate. The President shall
20 designate one of the members of the Council to serve as
21 chairman. Each member shall designate an alternative to sit
22 in his stead in the event of his unavoidable absence.

23 "(b) It shall be the responsibility of the Council to
24 assist the President in—

1 “(1) providing for the coordination of Federal pro-
2 grams and activities related to this Act;

3 “(2) developing basic policies and setting priorities
4 with respect to such programs and activities;

5 “(3) resolving differences arising among Federal
6 departments and agencies with respect to such programs
7 and activities; and

8 “(4) initiating and arranging for the carrying out
9 of specific actions or projects designed to achieve the
10 objectives of this Act.

11 “(c) The President shall appoint an Executive Secre-
12 tary of the Council. The Executive Secretary is authorized to
13 appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may
14 be necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties.
15 Employees of other Federal departments and agencies may
16 be detailed to the Council from time to time to provide
17 temporary assistance.

18 “(d) To the extent appropriate, a report of the activities
19 of the Council shall be included in the annual report of the
20 Director to the President and to the Congress, or in a sepa-
21 rate report to the Congress.

22 “(e) From the sums authorized and appropriated to
23 carry out the provisions of this title, the President shall re-

1 serve such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the
2 purposes of this section.

3 "RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

4 "SEC. 632. In addition to his other powers under this
5 Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the anti-
6 poverty efforts of all Federal agencies, the Director shall—

7 "(1) undertake special studies of specific coordina-
8 tion problems at the request of the President or the
9 Council, or on his own initiative;

10 "(2) carry on a continuing evaluation of all activi-
11 ties under this Act, and consult with interested agencies
12 and groups, including State agencies described in sec-
13 tion 231 of this Act and the National Advisory Council,
14 with a view to identifying coordination problems that
15 may warrant consideration by the Council or the Presi-
16 dent and, to the extent feasible or appropriate, initiate
17 action for overcoming those problems, either through the
18 Office of Economic Opportunity or in conjunction with
19 other Federal, State, or local agencies; and

20 "(3) prepare a five-year national poverty action
21 plan showing estimates of Federal and other govern-
22 mental expenditures, and, where feasible, the contri-
23 butions of the private sector, needed to eliminate
24 poverty in this country within alternative periods of
25 time. Such plan shall include estimates of the funds

1 necessary to finance all relevant programs authorized
2 by this and other Acts, and any new programs which
3 may be necessary to eliminate poverty in this country,
4 and it shall include recommendations for such new
5 programs. The plan shall be presented to the Congress
6 and updated on an annual basis.

7 “COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

8 “SEC. 633. (a) Federal agencies administering pro-
9 grams related to this Act shall—

10 “(1) cooperate with the Director and with the
11 Council in carrying out their duties and responsibilities;
12 and

13 “(2) carry out their programs and exercise their
14 functions so as to assist in carrying out the provisions
15 and purposes of this Act, to the fullest extent permitted
16 by other applicable law.

17 “(b) The Council and the Director may call upon Fed-
18 eral agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and
19 other materials as they deem necessary to discharge their
20 responsibilities under this Act.

21 “(c) The President may direct that particular programs
22 and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of Federal
23 agencies shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent
24 with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support
25 of programs authorized under this Act.

1 “COMBINATIONS AMONG PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

2 “SEC. 634. In order to encourage efficiencies, close
3 unnecessary service gaps, and generally promote more effective
4 administration, the Director shall require, to the fullest
5 extent feasible, that projects or programs assisted under this
6 Act be carried on so as to supplement one another, or where
7 appropriate other related programs or projects, and be included
8 within or otherwise carried on in combination with
9 community action programs. In the case of other programs
10 related to this Act, the heads of the Federal agencies responsible
11 for those programs shall, to the extent permitted by
12 law, similarly provide assistance for projects and activities in
13 a manner which encourages combinations with other related
14 projects and activities, where appropriate, and with community
15 action programs. The Economic Opportunity Council
16 shall, in carrying out its responsibilities under this part, make
17 a continuing review of the operation of this section with a
18 view to (1) determining particular groups of programs
19 which, because of their objectives, or similarities in target
20 groups or areas, are especially appropriate for combined or
21 closely coordinated operation at the State or local level, and
22 making recommendations accordingly to the President or
23 appropriate Federal officials; (2) evaluating Federal agency
24 procedures for carrying out this section, and developing or

1 recommending additional or common procedures, as appropriate; and (3) determining whether, and to what extent,
2 consolidations of Federal programs may be justified and
3 making recommendations respecting such consolidations to
4 the Director and the President.
5

6 "INFORMATION CENTER

7 "SEC. 635. (a) The Director shall establish and operate
8 an information center for the purpose of insuring that
9 maximum use is made of Federal programs related to this
10 Act and that information concerning those programs and
11 other relevant information is readily available to public
12 officials and other interested persons. The Director shall
13 collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute information
14 as described above, either free of charge or by sale at
15 cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's
16 account as an offset of that cost), and may make arrangements
17 and pay for any printing and binding without regard
18 to the provisions of any other law or regulations. In connection
19 with operation of the center, the Director may carry on
20 research or studies concerning the improvement of information
21 systems in support of the purposes of this Act, the
22 adequacy of existing data, ways in which data generated on
23 the State and local level may be incorporated into Federal

1 information systems, and methods by which data may be
2 made more readily available to State and local officials or
3 used to further coordination objectives.

4 “(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a
5 current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to in-
6 dividual and community improvement. He may also make
7 grants, from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this
8 Act, to States and communities to establish information
9 service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribu-
10 tion of information required to further the purposes of this
11 Act.

12 “(c) In order to assure that all appropriate officials are
13 kept fully informed of programs related to this Act, and
14 that maximum use is made of those programs, the Director
15 shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to
16 State and local agencies of all current information, including
17 administrative rules, regulations, and guidelines, required
18 by those agencies for the effective performance of their
19 responsibilities.

20 “PROHIBITION

21 “SEC. 636. In order to assure that existing Federal
22 agencies are used to the fullest extent possible in carrying
23 out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry
24 out this Act shall be used to establish any new department

1 or office when the intended function is being performed by
2 an existing department or office.

3 "SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: TRAINING PROGRAMS

4 "SEC. 637. (a) It shall be the responsibility of the
5 Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health,
6 Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other depart-
7 ments and agencies concerned, acting through such pro-
8 cedures or mechanisms as the President may prescribe, to
9 provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and
10 appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all
11 programs and activities within the executive branch of the
12 Government relating to the training of individuals for the
13 purpose of improving or restoring employability.

14 "(b) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agree-
15 ments as may be necessary or appropriate (which may in-
16 clude arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

17 "(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-
18 State employment service provides and develops its
19 capacity for providing maximum support for the pro-
20 grams described in subsection (a); and

21 "(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the
22 Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Di-
23 rector of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the
24 head of any other Federal agency administering a train-

1 ing program, such employment information as will facil-
2 itate the placement of individuals being trained.

3 “DEFINITIONS

4 “SEC. 638. As used in this part, ‘programs related to
5 this Act’ and ‘coordination’ shall include the programs and
6 actions described in this section:

7 “(1) ‘Programs related to this Act’ include pro-
8 grams under this Act and all Federal or federally assisted
9 programs which have objectives which are, in whole
10 or substantial part, complementary to the purposes of
11 this Act, or which provide resources which may be
12 used in combination with resources under this Act to
13 assist in achieving any of the purposes of this Act.

14 “(2) ‘Coordination’ includes, but is not limited to—

15 “(A) actions to improve the common effective-
16 ness of programs in reaching and serving the poor,
17 such as actions: to extend services to new areas,
18 provide them in a common place, or structure them
19 so that they are more readily accepted or widely
20 utilized; to eliminate procedures or requirements that
21 may be inappropriate for or result in unnecessary
22 hardship to disadvantaged persons with limited
23 education or other special handicaps; to establish
24 common eligibility standards among programs serv-
25 ing substantially similar groups or operating in the

1 same areas; or to develop methods of operation or
2 administration that will provide new employment
3 incentives or opportunities for the poor;

4 “ (B) actions to promote better use at the State
5 or local level of Federal assistance available under
6 diverse programs, such as actions to establish pro-
7 cedures for cooperation among State or local agencies
8 seeking assistance from different Federal sources
9 with a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication
10 and service gaps and promoting common or comple-
11 mentary priorities; or to modify or improve tech-
12 nical or administrative requirements imposed by
13 different Federal agencies that may operate to
14 increase unnecessarily the burdens of State or local
15 agencies, minimize their opportunities for the imag-
16 inative use of Federal assistance, or discourage their
17 cooperation with one another;

18 “ (C) actions to promote simplification and ef-
19 ficiencies through the joint or combined use of
20 Federal resources, such as actions to develop new
21 methods of processing requests for assistance or
22 granting assistance that will enable Federal agencies
23 more generally to use resources jointly in support of
24 common objectives; to establish common priorities
25 for purposes of program planning, research and

demonstration activities; and to effect combinations among or redirect Federal programs or activities for the purpose of eliminating unnecessary duplication;

“(D) actions to improve communication and general cooperation, such as actions to strengthen ties among regional offices of different Federal agencies and among such offices and other regional agencies or organizations; to develop and improve procedures by which Federal agencies may act together in promulgating or making available items of information, including information as to the availability and allocation of funds, which are closely related to one another for purposes of State or local planning and budgeting; or to develop procedures by which State and local agencies may be afforded new opportunities to participate in Federal policy decisions, including decisions on recommended legislation, affecting their capacity to operate efficiently and effectively.”

AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

SEC. 110. (a) Title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

1 "TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CER-
2 TAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

3 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

4 "SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to provide in-
5 centives to welfare recipients to participate in programs
6 which are designed to enable them to become self-support-
7 ing, and to complete such programs and become self-support-
8 ing within a reasonable period of time.

9 "STATE PLANS

10 "SEC. 702. Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I,
11 IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, a
12 State plan approved under any such title shall include pro-
13 visions consistent with the rules prescribed or under this title.

14 "DEFINITIONS

15 "SEC. 703. For the purposes of this title—

16 "(a) 'Public assistance' shall mean any aid or assist-
17 ance payable pursuant to a State plan approved under title I,
18 IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

19 "(b) 'Trainee' shall mean (1) any person enrolled in
20 any program under title I, II, or III-B of this Act or
21 employed in any such program as a resident nonprofessional
22 or in any other combined work-and-training capacity, (2)

1 any participant in any program assisted under the Emer-
2 gency Employment Act of 1967, or (3) any person who is
3 in training to become a VISTA volunteer and who has been
4 designated a volunteer trainee or intern.

5 “(c) ‘Qualifying income’ shall mean (1) any amount
6 paid as wages under title I of this Act to a trainee in a pro-
7 gram described in paragraph (1) of section 123 (a) of
8 this Act (relating to Neighborhood Youth Corps programs
9 for youth attending school); (2) any amount paid under
10 this Act or the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 as
11 wages, training allowance, or stipend to any other trainee
12 during his first eighteen months as such a trainee; and
13 (3) the net income derived, during the first eighteen months
14 following initial receipt of assistance under title III-A of
15 this Act, by any assisted family from the assisted farm or
16 nonagricultural enterprise.

17 “(d) ‘Poverty line’ shall mean an amount of monthly
18 income determined by the Director, representing an approxi-
19 mation of the minimum level of income which is necessary
20 to support a family of given size so that it can live out of
21 poverty.

22 “ATTRIBUTION OF INCOME

23 “SEC. 704. Unless otherwise provided in regulations pre-
24 scribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
25 no payment made under this Act to or on behalf of any

1 trainee or VISTA volunteer shall be regarded as income or
2 resources of any other individual under a State plan ap-
3 proved under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX except to
4 the extent that the payment is made available to or used for
5 the benefit of such other individual.

6 "AMOUNT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

7 "SEC. 705. (a) The amount of public assistance payable
8 for any month to any person having qualifying income shall
9 be the higher of (1) the amount determined under the State
10 plan without regard to this section, or (2) the amount deter-
11 mined under subsection (b).

12 "(b) The amount of public assistance which is payable
13 for any month to any person who receives qualifying income
14 shall be computed, for purposes of this subsection, as follows:

15 "(1) The amount of public assistance, excluding
16 assistance for medical care, shall be computed under the
17 State plan as if the qualifying income had not been re-
18 ceived (and without any provision for expenses con-
19 nected with earning the qualifying income).

20 "(2) If the qualifying income, when added to other
21 income of the recipient and the public assistance deter-
22 mined under clause (1), is insufficient to provide a total
23 income in excess of the monthly poverty line, the public
24 assistance payable (other than assistance for medical
25 care) shall be the amount determined under clause (1).

1 “(3) If the qualifying income, when added to other
2 income of the recipient and the public assistance deter-
3 mined under clause (1), exceeds the monthly poverty
4 line, the public assistance payable (other than assistance
5 for medical care) shall be the amount determined under
6 clause (1), reduced by a percentage of the excess. Such
7 percentage shall be determined so that public assistance
8 would be terminated if the qualifying income, when
9 added to the other income of the recipient, exceeded the
10 poverty line by 25 per centum or more: *Provided, how-*
11 *ever,* That such percentage shall in no event be larger
12 than $66\frac{2}{3}$ per centum.

13 “(4) Assistance for medical care shall be provided
14 in accordance with the State plan. In States where
15 the plan provides that assistance for medical care de-
16 pends upon eligibility for other public assistance, such
17 eligibility shall be determined in accordance with this
18 subsection.

19 “(c) If more than one member of a family receives
20 income, the income of all members of the family shall be
21 aggregated in making the computations under subsections
22 (b) (2) and (b) (3). The foregoing sentence shall not apply
23 in cases in which its application would be inconsistent with
24 section 704.

1 “SAVINGS PROVISION

2 “SEC. 706. If, at the time the rules prescribed in section
3 705 become effective in his State, a trainee's public assist-
4 ance is being computed in accordance with the prior version
5 of this title, it shall continue to be so computed until (1)
6 his rights under the prior version expire, or (2) he com-
7 pletes his participation in the particular program in which
8 he is a trainee, whichever occurs sooner. Thereafter, if he
9 receives additional qualifying income, his public assistance
10 shall be determined in accordance with section 705.”

11 (b) In the case of any State whose State plan meets
12 the requirements of section 701 of the Economic Oppor-
13 tunity Act of 1964 in effect prior to the amendment made
14 by subsection (2) of this section, no funds to which the State
15 is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or
16 XIX of the Social Security Act shall be withheld prior to
17 January 1, 1968, as a result of such amendment; nor shall
18 funds be withheld from any such State by reason of any
19 action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents the
20 State from complying with the requirements of such amend-
21 ment until the first day of the fourth month after the State
22 legislature next adjourns following the effective date of this
23 Act.

1 **VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS**

2 SEC. 111. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act
3 of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

4 **"TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE**
5 **PROGRAMS**

6 **"VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA**

7 **"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

8 "SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-
9 time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-
10 term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer
11 programs, together with other powers and responsibilities
12 designed to assist in the development and coordination of
13 volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and
14 supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and
15 enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups,
16 including elderly and retired Americans, to perform mean-
17 ingful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or
18 short-term programs in their home or nearby communities,
19 and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban
20 communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant work-
21 ers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions,
22 and situations where the application of human talent and
23 dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps

1 of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-
2 advancement.

3 “PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

4 “AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

5 “SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and
6 train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and
7 upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private
8 nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to
9 work—

10 “(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or
11 related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migra-
12 tory workers and their families, or of residents of the
13 District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,
14 Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the
15 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

16 “(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally
17 ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit
18 mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in
19 their construction or operation by Federal funds; and

20 “(3) in connection with programs or activities au-
21 thorized, supported, or of a character eligible for
22 assistance under this Act.

23 “(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section

1 shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions
2 on political activities that appropriately recognize the special
3 status of volunteers living among the persons or groups
4 served by programs to which they have been assigned) as
5 the Director may determine; but volunteers under this part
6 shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without
7 the consent of the Governor.

8 "TERMS OF SERVICE

9 "SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be re-
10 quired to make a full-time personal commitment to combating
11 poverty. To the extent practicable, this shall include a
12 commitment to live among and at the economic level of the
13 people served, and to remain available for service without
14 regard to regular working hours, at all times during their
15 term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.

16 "(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for
17 one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to train-
18 ing. The Director may, however, allow persons who are
19 unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as
20 volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than
21 two months where he determines that this more limited
22 service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

23 "(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and sub-
24 scribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by
25 section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001

1 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with
2 respect to that oath or affirmation.

3 "SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

4 "SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to
5 volunteers under this part while they are in training and on
6 assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month
7 during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide
8 a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons
9 who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance
10 with standards prescribed by him, have been designated
11 volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills.
12 The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel
13 (including travel to and from the place of training), and
14 leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment,
15 subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other
16 support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their
17 needs.

18 "(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of
19 a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances
20 the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend,
21 or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the
22 event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount
23 of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the
24 provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5
25 U.S.C. 5582).

1 “(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educa-
2 tional and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent
3 volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience
4 which they have derived from their training and service in
5 the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty
6 as members of the helping professions.

7 "PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER
8 PROGRAMS

9 "COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

10 "SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs
11 designed to expand opportunities for persons to partici-
12 pate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for
13 shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment
14 under section 810, and in their home or nearby communi-
15 ties, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination
16 of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or
17 arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical,
18 or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are
19 undertaken in connection with these programs. These
20 projects may include, without limitation, activities designed
21 (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to partici-
22 pate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted
23 under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs
24 designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2)
25 to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional,

1 or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for
2 the development or betterment of urban and rural neighbor-
3 hoods or areas having especially large concentrations or pro-
4 portions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping
5 residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the com-
6 petence necessary to take advantage of public and private
7 resources which would not otherwise be available or used for
8 those programs; and (3) to assist existing national and local
9 agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain
10 volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized
11 short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies
12 serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas
13 of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical
14 needs.

15 “(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section
16 shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such
17 other support or allowances as the Director determines, pur-
18 suant to regulations, are required because of unusual or
19 special circumstances affecting the project.

20 “(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable
21 as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any pro-
22 gram or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act,
23 shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the
24 Director under this section in providing for or assisting in

1 the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such per-
2 son.

3 "SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

4 "SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or
5 provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs
6 designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of pro-
7 viding volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer
8 participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not
9 to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated
10 from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal
11 year may be used for programs under this section.

12 "DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO HELP YOUNG ADULT

13 CRIMINAL OFFENDERS

14 "SEC. 822. (a) The Director is authorized to conduct,
15 or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements for the
16 conduct of demonstration projects in not more than four
17 areas during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and in
18 not more than six areas during each of the two succeeding
19 fiscal years, under which—

20 "(1) volunteers under part A, and members of
21 the Teacher Corps furnished pursuant to this section,
22 provide criminal offenders aged sixteen through twenty-
23 five with intensive education, training, and counseling

1 for at least a six-month period prior to their release
2 from confinement and for at least a six-month period
3 thereafter;

4 “(2) not more than one hundred such volunteers
5 are employed pursuant to this section during the fiscal
6 year ending June 30, 1968, and not more than one hun-
7 dred and fifty such volunteers are so employed during
8 each of the two succeeding fiscal years;

9 “(3) the Commissioner of Education furnishes, on
10 a reimbursable basis, for the purpose of this section,
11 members of the Teacher Corps who have been re-
12 cruited and trained by one or more institutions of
13 higher education; and

14 “(4) not more than forty such members are fur-
15 nished pursuant to this section during the fiscal year
16 ending June 30, 1968, and not more than sixty such
17 members are so furnished during each of the two suc-
18 ceeding fiscal years.

19 “(b) Members of the Teacher Corps enrolled for pur-
20 poses of this section, who are not experienced teachers, shall
21 be compensated at the rate of \$75 per week plus \$15 per
22 week for each dependent. Such members who are experi-
23 enced teachers shall be compensated at a rate to be fixed by

1 the Commissioner of Education. Assignment of members of
2 the Teacher Corps pursuant to this section shall be without
3 regard to the provisions of section 513 (c) of the Higher
4 Education Act of 1965.

5 "PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 "COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

7 "SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to
8 coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title
9 with one another, with community action programs, and
10 with other related Federal, State, local, and national pro-
11 grams. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible,
12 actions to promote service by volunteers or former volun-
13 teers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in
14 providing necessary support to programs under part B,
15 and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or
16 short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A
17 as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director
18 shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State,
19 local, and national agencies responsible for programs related
20 to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging
21 greater use of volunteer services in those programs and
22 establishing in connection with them systematic procedures
23 for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orienta-
24 tion or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant
25 to this part.

1 “PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

2 “SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall
3 take necessary steps, including the development of special
4 projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest partici-
5 pation of older persons as volunteers in the various pro-
6 grams and activities authorized under this title and, because
7 of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty
8 group, shall encourage the development of a variety of
9 volunteer services to older persons, including special projects,
10 to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.

11 “APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

12 “SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b),
13 volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal
14 employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws
15 relating to Federal employment.

16 “(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance
17 or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services
18 or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter
19 III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, per-
20 sons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Gov-
21 ernment, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same
22 extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116 (a)
23 (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of
24 the computation described in 116 (a) (2) (B) the monthly
25 pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under

1 the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5.
2 United States Code.

3 "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

4 "SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations
5 to assure that service under this title is limited to activities
6 which would not otherwise be performed and which will not
7 result in the displacement of employed workers or impair
8 existing contracts for service.

9 "(b) All support, including transportation provided to
10 volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest
11 possible cost consistent with the effective operations of
12 volunteer programs.

13 "(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are
14 assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any
15 volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any
16 compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such
17 agency or organization.

18 "DURATION OF PROGRAM

19 "SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs
20 provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June
21 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each
22 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the
23 Congress may authorize by law."

AMENDMENT TO THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND
TRAINING ACT

SEC. 112. Section 203 (c) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is amended to strike out "at a rate not in excess of \$20 a week" in the second sentence, and insert in lieu thereof "at a rate which shall not exceed the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available,".

TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 113. (a) Part C of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by renumbering the section numbers to read 141 through 146, respectively.

(b) Part E of title I of such Act is amended by renumbering section 141 to read 161.

(c) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council," the following: "of the Executive Secretary of the Economic Opportunity Council,".

1 TITLE II—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

2 SHORT TITLE

3 SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the “Emergency
4 Employment Act of 1967”.

5 FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

6 SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds that certain commu-
7 nities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by
8 severe unemployment and underemployment. Such areas
9 contain large concentrations or proportions of persons who
10 are unable to obtain jobs in regular competitive employment
11 because of lack of education, occupational skill, or work ex-
12 perience and because of artificial barriers to employment and
13 occupational advancement. This situation is aggravated by
14 migration of unskilled rural residents to urban areas. Many of
15 the affected areas are doubly handicapped by the lack of
16 sufficient jobs for all the potential labor force. This condi-
17 tion is destructive of human dignity and results in a loss
18 of national productivity. In many localities the problem
19 has reached crisis proportion by contributing to social unrest
20 and civil disorder.

21 (b) At the same time there is a huge backlog of need
22 for additional public services and public facilities in such
23 fields as those which (1) contribute to the development of
24 human potential, (2) better the conditions under which

1 people live, learn, and work, and (3) aid in the develop-
2 ment and conservation of natural resources.

3 (c) Therefore, it is the purpose of this title to provide
4 meaningful employment opportunities in public service and
5 other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in
6 urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest
7 by fulfilling unmet needs.

8 ELIGIBLE AREAS

9 SEC. 203. The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred
10 to as the "Secretary") shall designate urban and rural areas
11 to be eligible for assistance under this title. Such areas shall
12 contain a high concentration or proportion of low-income
13 families and individuals and shall have severe problems of
14 unemployment and underemployment. They may be defined
15 without regard to political boundaries.

16 FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

17 SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide
18 financial assistance to public agencies and private organiza-
19 tions for part or all of the costs of programs which create
20 meaningful public service and other employment oppor-
21 tunities. He shall adopt procedures to assure (1) that there
22 is maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility
23 with full participation of and maximum cooperation among
24 local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and repre-

1 representatives of private organizations in the establishment of
2 programs under this title, including, without limitation, the
3 determination of areas and participants eligible for assistance
4 and the selection of projects under subsection (b) of this
5 section, and (2) that such assistance is fully coordinated
6 with programs operated under the Manpower Development
7 and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of
8 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of
9 1965, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Develop-
10 ment Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal Acts.

11 (b) Jobs created or made available under this title
12 may include services and supporting facilities in such fields
13 as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks
14 and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood im-
15 provement, conservation and rural development, beautifica-
16 tion, and other fields of human betterment and public im-
17 provement. Such jobs shall include (1) those which can be
18 made available immediately to persons who are otherwise
19 unable to obtain employment, (2) those which provide
20 placement resources for persons completing training under
21 titles I and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and other
22 relevant manpower training programs, and (3) those which
23 use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic
24 labor surplus. Priority shall be given to projects which are
25 labor intensive in character.

1 (c) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial
2 assistance to assure that (1) persons employed in jobs
3 created by this title are provided opportunity for further edu-
4 cation, training, and necessary supportive services, including
5 those provided by other relevant Acts, so that they may be
6 prepared to obtain regular competitive employment in the
7 future; and (2) that maximum effort is made to encourage
8 private employers to adopt innovative approaches which
9 create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-
10 income and disadvantaged persons.

11 LOANS

12 SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make
13 loans to public and private agencies for the purchase of sup-
14 plies and equipment which support and supplement projects
15 carried out by participants under section 204.

16 (b) Loans authorized under this section may be made
17 without interest and under such other terms and conditions
18 as the Secretary may prescribe.

19 ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

20 SEC. 206. Participants in programs under this title must
21 be unemployed or low-income persons who reside in eligible
22 areas and who meet other criteria prescribed by the Secre-
23 tary. Low income shall be defined in terms of section 125
24 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

1 SPECIAL CONDITIONS

2 SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial
3 assistance for any program under this title unless he deter-
4 mines, in accordance with such regulations as he may pre-
5 scribe, that—

6 (1) no participant will be employed on projects in-
7 volving political parties, or the construction, operation,
8 or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or
9 to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for
10 religious worship;

11 (2) the program will not result in displacement of
12 employed workers or impair existing contracts for serv-
13 ices, or result in the substitution of Federal for other
14 funds in connection with work that would otherwise be
15 performed;

16 (3) wages paid a participant shall not be lower
17 than, whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum
18 wage which would be applicable to the employment
19 under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section
20 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not
21 exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local
22 minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered
23 employment, or (C) the prevailing rate of wages in
24 the area for similar work.

(4) the program will, to the extent appropriate, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

(b) For programs related to physical improvements preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families in urban neighborhoods or rural areas having concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this title have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

(d) Programs approved under this title shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

REPORTS

SEC. 208. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress made in implementing this title and suggestions for improvements on or before May 15, 1968, November 15, 1968, and on or before May 15 and November 15 of each year thereafter.

1 AUTHORIZATIONS

2 SEC. 209. (a) For the purposes of carrying out the pro-
3 visions of this title, except the provisions of section 205, there
4 is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,-
5 000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and
6 \$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

7 (b) For the purpose of making loans under section 205,
8 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$300,000,000
9 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

10 (c) Appropriations authorized by this section shall
11 remain available until expended.

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2388

[Report No. 563]

A BILL

To provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Clark

SEPTEMBER 12 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 11), 1967
Read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar



United States
of America

Division of Legislative Reporting
Office of Budget and Finance

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1967

No. 143

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, September 11, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art above all and in all, apart from Thee, life has no meaning or destiny. We are made confident in our hearts that Thy mercy endureth forever, without Thee our striving would be losing—our strength is unequal to our tasks.

Our needs are many but our greatest need is of Thee.

In this hallowed moment, we bring to the altar of prayer our inmost selves, cluttered and confused where the good and the evil, the petty and the great, the wheat and the tares are so entwined.

Breathe now in this quiet moment Thy peace on hearts that pray—the peace that comes only when our jarring discords are tuned to the music of Thy will.

Grant us as laborers together with Thee a sense of untapped spiritual resources and restore our souls with the joyous strength of Thy salvation.

We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 11, 1967, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, despite the unanimous-consent order issued yesterday with respect to the pending bill, I may proceed for not in excess of 5 minutes on another subject.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am not in a position to clear it with the other side of the aisle. I cannot agree to it at this moment. As soon as I can clear it on the other side of the aisle—I do not object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2388—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—INDIVIDUAL AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 563)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit a report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on an original bill which has been assigned the number S. 2388. This bill amends the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, authorizes additional funds for poverty programs, and authorizes a new Emergency Employment Act of 1967. I ask unanimous consent that individual and additional views may be filed before midnight tonight, and printed with the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I note for the RECORD that this bill is a substitute for S. 1545, which was the original antipoverty amendments of 1967 to the Economic Opportunity Act.

RESOLUTION TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT TO ACCOMPANY S. 2388

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution authorizing the printing of 3,000 additional copies of the report I have just filed of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to accompany S. 2388, a bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The demand for this report, which is being filed in the Senate today, is such that the House and Senate document rooms will need and have already ordered the maximum number of copies available. As a result, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will receive

no more than 50 copies for its use, an amount which is quite inadequate. It is therefore imperative that additional copies be printed tonight by the Government Printing Office.

I have consulted with the acting majority leader, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. They have agreed that the Senate may consider this resolution immediately. I have also checked with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], at the request of Senator CURTIS.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 168) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 3,000 additional copies of its report to the Senate to accompany S. 2388, a bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1880) to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in order that interested Senators may be notified that the unfinished business has been laid before the Senate, and that the Senate is ready to proceed with the consideration of that business, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

SEPTEMBER 11, 1967.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call may not be charged to either side.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It will not be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEMONSTRATIONS IN THE GALLERIES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, yesterday five spectators were escorted from the Senate visitors' gallery after they dropped anti-Vietnam literature to the floor of the Senate Chamber. Three of the spectators were male and two were female. They were arrested and charged with disorderly conduct, and their names and addresses were as follows:

Jill Ann Boskey, 19 Colony Drive East, West Orange, N.J.

Eleanor Mayo Dorsey, Prince Street, Beverly, Mass.

Keith Richmond Lampe, 1107 O Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Rodney Edmond Robinson, 117 Grove Road, Washington Grove, Md.

Reginald Edwin Johnson, 1107 O Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, as the able minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL] said yesterday, this crude and arrogant attempt to apply pressure to the Senate of the United States is an affront—not only to Congress but also to the American people—that cannot and will not be tolerated.

The threat that "there will be sustained disruptions of the Government apparatus" until the demands of this, or any group or committee, are met must be branded for what it is—a threat to substitute anarchy for law and order.

It is a contemptible effort at coercion, one that strikes at the foundations of the orderly processes that protect the rights of all Americans including the group that made the threat.

Citizens, of course, have the right to petition for the redress of grievances. But this insult to Congress goes far beyond any right, civil or otherwise. It is of the same nauseous stripe as lawless burnings and lootings—which also have been done in the name of a cause.

This is another sickening manifestation of the increasing deterioration in America of respect for law and order. We see it on every hand—the attempt to substitute fear and hate and chaos for democratic processes. Such methods are abhorrent to all right-thinking Americans.

Many people in our country are opposed to the war in Vietnam. They have a constitutionally protected right to disagree with its conduct. They have a right to be heard—and, I may add, they have been heard at great lengths.

But no group has a right to attempt to force others to agree with the viewpoints held by that group. No individual or group of individuals has any right to attempt to intimidate the Members of Congress who must not and will not be so intimidated. Nor has any person or group a right to distort and cheapen and pervert the guarantees and the intent of the first amendment freedoms of speech and press.

There are many proper channels for expressing disapproval or disagreement. Dropping despicable and threatening leaflets from the galleries of the Senate is not one such channel. This is a brazen act which Congress cannot permit to be repeated.

It clearly points up the need for legislation to deal with the possible recurrence of such a disgraceful situation and to appropriately punish any individuals who would seek to interfere in this way with the work of the Congress.

Mr. President, legislation to deal with problems of this nature has recently been introduced by Senator MANSFIELD and Senator DIRKSEN. In the absence of Senator MANSFIELD, I urge that expeditious action be taken by the appropriate committees of jurisdiction and that the legislation be enacted by both Houses at the earliest possible moment. This is no time to temporize or to delay. The public business must go forward without any interference or obstruction by those who would impede the legislative process by methods of a revolutionary nature.

I am advised by the legislative counsel that, at the present time, there are no laws on the books prohibiting demonstrations in the Senate. As of now, violators are being prosecuted under title 22, sections 1107 and 1121, of the District of Columbia Code, "Disturbance of the Peace." The fine is a maximum \$250 and/or 90 days in jail.

Title 40, section 193F and following of the United States Code provide penalties for demonstrations on the Capitol Grounds. The fine is \$100 and 60 days in jail. If the damage to public property is more than \$100, the provisions are up to 5 years in jail.

As I have already indicated there has been introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Public Works S. 2310, which provides more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds.

Mr. President, I also urge that the doorkeepers to the galleries and other appropriate personnel stationed therein be constantly on the alert to prevent the occurrence of incidents similar to yesterday's demonstration. Moreover, it would be well for all Senators to instruct the staffs in their offices to be more than ever careful in the issuance of gallery passes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD one of the anti-Vietnam leaflets to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the leaflet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To all U.S. Congressmen:

Your first order of business this session should be a general declaration of peace—followed by immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam, an end to conscription, and an end to the suppression of black Americans.

Until you meet these emergencies there will be sustained disruptions of the government apparatus.

NATIONAL MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE DIRECT ACTION PROJECT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the able Senator is eminently correct in the comments he has made. I am glad to join with him, speaking for the minority, in urging speedy consideration of the legislation introduced by our distinguished majority and minority leaders. I wish to commend my able friend, the acting majority leader, for the comments he has made on this occasion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my friend, the able Senator from California.

ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1880) to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, is any amendment pending at the present time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No amendment is pending at the moment.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT NO. 292

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] and myself, amendment No. 292.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 10, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following new subsection:

"(j) The term 'Comptroller General' means the Comptroller General of the United States;"

On page 10, line 24, strike out "(j)" and insert in lieu thereof "(k)".

On page 12, line 12, strike out "Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be" and insert in lieu thereof "Comptroller General".

On page 12, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be," and insert in lieu thereof "Comptroller General".

On page 12, lines 23 and 24 strike out "Secretary or Clerk, as the case may be," and insert in lieu thereof "Comptroller General".

On page 14, line 4, strike out "Secretary or Clerk" and insert in lieu thereof "Comptroller General".

that the Viet Cong are not fighting against a clique but against the overwhelming will of the South Vietnamese people. The VC may be persuaded that the Saigon government is here to stay and conclude that it cannot be overthrown by force.

Second, President-Elect Thieu can now offer to negotiate with Hanoi and the VC from strength and will undoubtedly do so in the near future. He will have the support of the United States in such an offer and then the decision will be Hanoi's—whether to make peace or continue the fighting in the hope that the United States will weary and withdraw.

MEANINGFUL ELECTION

Was the election really fair? The observer-team said yes, that the precautions against fraud were even more thorough than in the United States. But Sen. Robert Kennedy said before the elections that he would prefer to rely on the judgment of the American correspondents on the spot. Here is their verdict:

"A pool of 12 reporters from American newspapers, who had studied the voting throughout the country, concluded that the election had been conducted honestly."

The Vietnam elections were not meaningless; they were meaningful.

IMPERSONAL, COMPUTERIZED TAX COLLECTION

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, we get more and more, newer and newer gadgets all the time, but how many of them add one iota to human happiness?

One of the newest gadgets of which the U.S. Government seems to be proudest is its automated, computerized tax-collecting machine.

Somewhere in West Virginia is a monster computer that is attempting—and I stress "attempting"—to digest the Federal tax problems of 200 million Americans. According to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, it is the greatest innovation since sliced bread.

I wonder.

In the first place, the monster computer appears to make an incredible number of errors; and once they are made, it seems incapable of correcting these errors.

Second, have you ever tried corresponding with an IBM machine? It cannot be done.

Last, but not least, Mr. President, have you ever tried to decipher one of the computer print-outs that IRS sends to all of us? If we knew every section of the Internal Revenue Code by heart, have an engineering degree from MIT, have spent 4 years in the Army decoding section, we might have a chance.

To illustrate the human side of this inhuman machine, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Portland, Maine, Press Herald.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENSIONER COMPLAINS OF IRS HARASSMENT

EDITOR OF THE PRESS HERALD: The Constitution on which our country is founded promises that all men are free and equal and entitled to the pursuit of happiness. Today we may ask what freedom, what happiness? We are living under a dictatorship as cruel as any in history.

Here is one small example: The writer is 78 years of age, seriously ill, and barely existing on a small pension to which she con-

tributed during her working years. At the proper time and with a real effort she filed an income tax report. No comment having been received from Internal Revenue, she assumed the report was accepted. Then several months later, like a bolt from the blue, came a bill on an IBM form billing her for a ridiculous amount of tax plus interest, with payment demanded within 20 days. Imagine the shock.

This bill was returned to Internal Revenue with an explanation that no exemptions had been credited. There was no reply to this. A second time a bill came with more interest added. Again the writer asked that correction be made. No reply. When the third bill came the matter was taken to a lawyer who filed an amended report.

Now comes a blast from Augusta headquarters threatening to put a lien on any and all property. That means the little home which was to provide shelter for the reclining years. This amounts to persecution.

Again we ask "what freedom, what happiness?"

What rights have poor slobes like us?
We want to know.

MARY S. SPEAR.

Friendship.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, regardless of the merits or demerits of this particular case, I do know that there must be some better way to deal with American taxpayers than the current, de-personalized, implacable computer system being devised by the Internal Revenue Service.

It may make work for the tax collectors a bit easier, but it surely is hard on 200 million Americans.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that individual views which I have submitted for inclusion in the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 1545 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the individual views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

While I voted to report the bill, S. 1545, I believe Title II should be stricken and referred back to the Committee for appropriate hearings and study. In addition, I am convinced that several of the programs authorized by this legislation would operate more effectively if certain amendments were adopted on the floor.

A. JOB CORPS

It is gratifying to note that some of the criticisms directed at this part finally have been recognized, and revisions are being made. This bill tightens the administration of the Job Corps program, provides specifically for urban skill centers, and improves the machinery for follow up and job placement.

I believe that the Job Corps should be administered by the Office of Education instead of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Such a transfer would help to eliminate areas of overlap between Job Corps and other vocational education programs being conducted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

It is worth noting that, at present, the bulk of the Job Corps training effort is in its 28 urban centers; and that 20 of those centers—more than 70 percent of the total—are run by private enterprise, under contract with OEO. A study made for the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty as a part of its 1967 review of the war on poverty indicates that private enterprise is generally doing a better job than non-profit organizations in operating centers

and training enrollees. The record would seem to justify an expansion of the practice of contracting with private firms for the operation of Job Corps centers.

I also believe that more involvement by the States would be desirable. The mandatory language of section 114 of the pending bill is a move in that direction. As consultant Sar A. Levitan has pointed out (Levitan, "Can the War on Poverty Rise Above Partisan Politics," *Cong. Rec.*, Aug. 8, 1967, A 4024 at A 4025):

"The Job Corps has not sufficiently utilized the educational and vocational capabilities of states. It could have avoided a great many problems if state agencies had been drawn into the administration of centers."

"The data developed by the Job Corps indicate that some conservation centers in particular do a poor educational job. The situation may be corrected by turning these centers over to the state educational agencies. . . ."

Section 108(b) of the pending bill expressly authorizes the use of local educational agencies, vocational institutions and technical institutes. This provision contains significant potential for re-establishing a more appropriate Federal-local balance.

In 1964, as a member of the House of Representatives, I joined in minority views when the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor. In those views, Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, a distinguished psychologist and professor of the Departments of Psychology and of Child Development and Family Relationships of Cornell University, was quoted as follows (H. Rept. No. 1458, 88th Cong. 2d Sess., 71):

"Unless the young person is trained in a job which his home community can use, unless he has learned patterns of social and civic behavior which are appropriate to that community, and unless that community is prepared to accept him in a new and more positive role, the young person will return only to be pushed back into the part in which he was formerly cast—the social misfit."

We added, "The need is to equip these young people to cope with their community: the need is not to equip them to commune with nature."

During the past three years painful experience has indicated the validity of that point. Clearly, community coordination is essential to a program designed to enable youths to join the community.

B. TITLE I-B

The 1967 amendments would place Title I-B under a "prime sponsor" which, in most instances, would be the Community Action Agency established under Title II. The CAA is "encouraged" to use public and private organizations as delegate agencies, to include the poor in planning, in the conduct and administration of programs, and also to provide maximum employment and training opportunities for such persons. The original Title I-B was the "Neighborhood Youth Corps," limited to persons in the 9th to 12th grades. As revised, the Part combines a series of work and training programs for persons age 16 and over and an array of other enumerated "special programs" oriented to the employment of persons of all ages. It adds a program for areas of concentrated unemployment and a private employer incentive program. The CAA is directed to provide systematic planning and linkage (in section 121(c)).

I am concerned that the task of coordination, as well as the administration of such a conglomeration and proliferation of purposes, participants and special activities, will overwhelm the administrative capacities of CAA's; some of them have not distinguished themselves in the past as models of administrative efficiency.

In the 1964 minority views, discussing the Neighborhood Youth Corps, we warned (H. Rept. No. 1458, 73):

"As with the 'Job Corps' proposal, the contribution, if any, that this program will make toward equipping young people for employment is highly questionable. Having recently approved a vocational work-study program for youth in this age group, and having expanded the Manpower Act to assist the same individuals, Congress should place its reliance upon these established Federal activities rather than embarking upon new, costly, ill-considered efforts which would only compete with and confuse the existing programs."

Unfortunately, subsequent events have borne out the accuracy of that warning. A Subcommittee publication entitled "Emergency Employment Act—Background Information" states (Mangum, "The Need for an Employment Guarantee," 131):

"NYC [Neighborhood Youth Corps] and Job Corps graduates face the same job markets after leaving the programs that they faced before, one-half of the public assistance recipients who enter work experience and training program return to public assistance when they leave it."

A private survey recently revealed that only 38.2 percent of out-of-school NYC enrollees return to school, receive additional training or are employed after completing the program. ("Youth and the War on Poverty," prepared for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 29.)

Indeed, as it is operated, the prime function of the NYC may be merely that of an "aging vat" to tide teenagers over until they are able to apply for "real" jobs. While this limited function may have some merit, the NYC experience could be far more meaningful if the NYC program measured up to its initial purpose—to enable participants to attend school or to help them "develop their maximum occupational potential." (Section 112 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.)

The in-school Title I-B program was designed as an educational training and income maintenance program. In my view, this educational program should be transferred to the Office of Education and administered in coordination with other work-study programs. Such a transfer would help preserve the original purpose of the section, reduce overlapping and duplicitous efforts, and would assure that contracts with school systems would be made through the Office of Education.

In addition, I believe that the out-of-school Title I-B program should be transferred to, and administered by, the Department of Labor. That Department would then be in a position to bring these programs into closer coordination with other job training programs—programs which are more closely related to the needs of the job market.

The isolation of Youth Corps programs from "real" jobs could well explain the difficulty experienced in some cities in recruiting enrollees. Understandably, eligible youths see little future in devoting themselves to morale-deflating, make-work projects. As the Subcommittee's publication points out (Mangum, 131 at 133):

"The assumption that the out-of-school, out-of-work youth is eager for steady, low-wage, low prestige job clashes with experience."

The committee added \$10 million to the Title I-B authorization for pilot projects in which OEO would provide incentives for the private employment of "hard core" unemployables. The employees would work for private employers, who would be expected to provide useful training and supportive services. Under this amendment, employees would receive not less than the federal minimum wage; and OEO could pay the employer

any difference between a worker's real worth and his wage rate, as well as other costs, such as the expenses of counseling, recruiting and transportation.

I have long advocated measures to encourage private industry to train and employ marginal workers, but I am concerned that the approach adopted for the first time in this bill contains pitfalls. I am pleased that the program wisely has been advanced as a pilot project only, so that potential problems may be explored and satisfactory limitations and guidelines may be developed if necessary.

Along with a number of other Members of Congress, I have sponsored a bill entitled the Human Investment Act, which seeks to provide a tax credit for private employers who hire and train the hard-core unemployed. I believe this approach would be preferable.

C. COMMUNITY ACTION

The 1966 requirement that from 5 percent to 10 percent of community action funds be channeled to local groups outside the Community Action Agency has been deleted. In its place the pending bill provides (in section 220(c)) that the Director "may and is encouraged to" assist agencies other than the CAA to carry out component programs. However, the new language qualifies the Director's authority by prescribing that he may act only "after soliciting and considering comments of the community action agency."

The broadening of CAA control may serve to strengthen city-wide coordination; however, in some instances it could also result in the curbing of individual local initiative. For example, if "city hall" controls the CAA, and if the poor mistrust "city hall," then the poor can be expected to mistrust the CAA. In such situations, there may be understandable hesitation on the part of the poor to participate to the "maximum feasible" extent in CAA-run programs. Yet, such participation is supposed to be a key element in the philosophy and purposes of the Act.

Accordingly, it is hoped that the Director will take appropriate advantage of the authority which is left in Section 220(c) to assist local groups outside the CAA where circumstances justify it.

OEO involvement with education

In my view, the OEO should not become intimately involved with ongoing educational programs. Those poverty programs which are essentially part of the educational process should be transferred to, and administered by, the Office of Education. I refer in particular to the following:

- i. Title I-B Work-Training (in its educational aspects).
- ii. Headstart (and see below).
- iii. Follow Through (and see below).
- iv. Upward Bound.

The Headstart program, according to OEO Director Sargent Shriver, is OEO's "greatest single measurable success." The Job Corps has been vehemently attacked because of scandalously high costs and the misconduct of some enrollees. The Neighborhood Youth Corps has been criticized because of its failure to provide meaningful work and training instead of make-work, and Community Action programs have been under attack because of administrative floundering and politicking. On the other hand, Headstart, in most instances, has been the one shining light that has rallied public support for the poverty war. Many constituents have told me that they think the whole "war on poverty" program should be scrapped—except for Headstart.

Because of the recognized merit of Headstart, Republican members of the Committee proposed that \$352 million of the funds to be authorized be earmarked specifically for Headstart. However, this proposal was rejected by majority members. I believe an amendment to accomplish this purpose should be adopted on the floor so that Head-

start will not be forced to compete with other schemes and proposals for the administrative favor of OEO.

OEO is talking about spending \$120 million in the coming year for its new "Follow Through" program. From all indications, such a sum vastly exceeds the amount needed for the number of programs which can be reasonably mobilized within the year. By now OEO should have learned the price of hasty overspending on new programs. We believe that a substantial portion of the excessive Follow Through funds should be redirected to Headstart.

Follow Through, a \$120 million/\$160 per child program, contains particularly disturbing implications respecting the established system of Federal-State-local relationships. The program focuses on Headstart children as they go on to kindergarten and the first three grades of elementary school. Thus, the program initiates the actual involvement of OEO in the educational process within the school system. Evidently the involvement contemplated is not limited to contacts with the State agency or local board. Instead, Follow Through envisions the actual conduct of in-school programs by CAA's or their delegate agencies.

What is the extent of the planned OEO involvement with the educational process in Follow Through? The language in the bill is ambiguous. Section 243(4) purports to prohibit general aid to education, but it adds, "other than for special health, welfare, remedial, and other non-curricular services designed to encourage successful participation in school"—whatever that may mean. Further doubts are cast upon the Section 243 disclaimer by Section 221, which describes Follow Through and other "special impact" programs. Section 221(b)(2) authorizes, as a part of the program, "comprehensive services... as described in [the Headstart paragraph]," and that paragraph, detailing the preschool program, expressly cites "comprehensive health, nutritional, education, social, and other services." (Emphasis added.)

Section 222 requires the maximum employment of the poor in all component programs. Presumably, this requires the CAA to assure that a maximum number of poor persons are brought into the schools to work on Follow Through projects. Also, VISTA workers could be assigned to these programs. In my view, while involvement of the poor in other OEO programs is important, employment policies within the nation's schools should be left to appropriate school authorities.

Finally, Section 221(b)(2) describes Follow Through as "focused primarily upon children... who were previously enrolled in Headstart or similar programs." Accordingly, it appears that children who needed Headstart training but did not get it, for one reason or another, will generally be excluded from the benefits of Follow Through.

As now written, provisions of the bill authorizing the new Follow Through program are loosely worded and leave much to be desired. I believe the language should be revised and tightened.

The above-mentioned 1964 minority views in which I participated foresaw the danger of increasing OEO involvement in areas properly within the jurisdiction of other agencies. At that time, we predicted that (H. Rep. No. 1458, 70):

"This reliance on broad, undefined power [for OEO], with its companion reliance on direct Federal action at all levels of our society, represents a dangerous assault on the established system of State-Federal relationships, as well as upon the orderly administration of programs and policies already entrusted to established agencies of government."

Unfortunately, it is obvious that the assault continues, and jurisdictional overlap within the federal executive branch is increasing.

D. DAY CARE

A new Title V-B has been added to give express authority for establishment of day care projects so that low-income parents may engage in education, training or work.

In addition to making it possible for individual adults to improve or advance themselves, a well-run day-care center may have other desirable effects. For example, it can provide poor children with needed nutritional and social development benefits.

In the administration of the day care program it is hoped that there will not be a repeat of those notorious Headstart "poverty" programs under which 20 percent to 30 percent of the participants came from middle income families. Obviously, when children from middle income families are recruited and allowed to take advantage of programs intended to help the poor, not only are the taxpayers cheated but, in some instances, needy children are deprived of opportunities which the act seeks to provide.

E. FUTURE OF OEO

A central issue underlying any discussion of the Poverty War, I believe, is the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have recommended the transfer of Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and certain Community Action programs to other Federal agencies. I advocate such transfers because I believe it is in the national interest to structure an antipoverty effort that will minimize—not maximize—the overlap, competition and duplication of efforts.

A basic myth surrounds the Office of Economic Opportunity: the myth that OEO neatly plans and organizes the nation's antipoverty effort. It does not. On paper, OEO is part of the Executive Office of the President. But, in fact, it enjoys no special status comparable, for example, to the Bureau of the Budget. Rather it has become just another operating agency, like HEW, the Department of Labor and other departments.

As a staff report to the Senate subcommittee observed (JLS, "Issues of Organization and Coordination," June 16, 1967, 2):

"(I)t was inevitable that its [OEO's] operating responsibilities would absorb virtually all of the energies of its leadership and that its Government-wide 'Chief of Staff' functions would suffer. As the consequence, a full-fledged headquarters for the war on poverty as a whole has not developed."

OEO is not fulfilling its primary role as leader, planner and coordinator of the poverty war because it is too busy with the myriad of details involved in operating the various poverty programs.

I do not suggest that OEO must be abolished. But I do believe it should be reorganized—if not administratively, then legislatively.

A reorganized and reoriented "Office of Economic Opportunity" could finally perform the most important function originally intended for it. In form OEO would be smaller, since it would be freed from day-to-day routine formalities and operational paper work. However, the service of OEO to the country should be far more significant than it is today. For the first time it could actually concentrate on becoming the planning and coordinating agency of the three-year-old War on Poverty.

F. EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

Unrest in the cities of the Nation has reached grave proportions. The tremendous amalgam of social problems that gives rise to this unrest demands our most urgent attention. But this is a situation in which greater, not less, Congressional wisdom is imperative.

Title II, the so-called "Emergency Employment Act," is an unfortunate example of hasty, unsound Congressional reaction to the riots. It is as extravagant in its promise as it is vague in its operation.

The Committee has had no real opportunity to consider the proposal in depth.

The record contains no statement of the Administration's views regarding the merits of the program, its effect on the poverty war or on the budget.

How such a program would relate to ongoing job creation and training programs has not been explored.

Finally, consideration has not been given to more effective alternatives that are available, e.g., the Human Investment Act proposal which would encourage private industry to hire and train the hard-core unemployed.

Instead of holding hearings, the Subcommittee released a booklet entitled "Emergency Employment Act—Background Materials." The booklet is supposed to establish the need for Title II. In fact, however, the material also emphasizes that superficial, short-term make-work programs do not solve long-term unemployment problems, and that efforts should be directed toward training and education.

As written, the title would constitute a virtual abdication of Congressional responsibility; it would delegate almost unlimited authority and discretion to the Secretary of Labor.

Before Congress approves an expenditure of nearly \$3 billion, principally for make-work, no-future "public service" jobs, at least some time should be taken to consider whether that approach is the best of those available.

Unfortunately, weighing alternatives and developing major legislation takes a little time. Nevertheless, I believe it is time that should be taken. The Committee should conduct appropriate hearings on Title II.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HEALTH OFFICIALS TO SEEK STRICTER X-RAY REGULATIONS

Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. President, on August 30 the Committee on Commerce completed 3 days of hearings on S. 2067, the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1967. The committee heard from a wide range of professional, governmental, and industry witnesses, and is now in the process of evaluating that testimony. Two things seem obvious at this point. One is that our inquiry must be continued, probably early in the second session of this Congress. The second is that we are dealing with a far-ranging and significant set of problems which demand the exercise of foresight and the formulation of an effective legislative remedy. I am confident that we are moving in that direction.

It is always true, however, that a hearing points up more problems than subsequent legislation can solve. One of the hearings's most valuable functions, therefore, is not merely to lay the foundation for legislation but also to increase public and professional awareness of certain problems and to prompt extra legislative attempts to rectify certain situations. This is obviously the case with regard to the testimony we heard regarding the employment of diagnostic medical and dental devices.

S. 2067 might prove to be a partial remedy in that it would authorize the setting of standards for new equipment. It might be amended to provide for the updating of old equipment or to improve existing programs of inspection and training. But a large measure of the responsibility for the protection of opera-

tors and patients will continue to rest with State and local governments, with professional societies, with equipment manufacturers, and with individual practitioners. Therefore, it is to be hoped that our hearings will contribute to a greater awareness in these sectors of potential radiation hazards and a greater concern for radiation safety.

One interesting example of local efforts to bring the use of X-ray equipment under more effective control was reported in the Washington Post of September 5. The story is encouraging in its portrayal of a vigorous local effort, but it is discouraging in its relating of the problems that must be met and the obstacles that are still to be overcome. In any case, it is instructive, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STRICTER MEDICAL X-RAY REGULATIONS ASKED
(By Stuart Auerbach)

District health officials, only partially successful in achieving voluntary compliance with their safety recommendations, have decided to seek strict regulations for medical X-ray machines.

Although most dentists complied with recommendations made by Health Department inspectors, Marshall S. Little, chief of the Radiological Health Division, said that individual physicians have been less willing to follow the advice of inspectors who are not doctors. The District Medical Society, however, has cooperated fully, he said.

Little, who began dealing with radiation as a radioisotope chemist with the World War II Manhattan Project that developed the atomic bomb, said some physicians and dentists have refused to allow inspections or follow-up visits.

Karl Z. Morgan of the Oak Ridge, Tenn., National Laboratory testified last week before the Senate Commerce Committee that between 3500 and 29,000 U.S. residents now living may die as a result of exposure to radiation.

Despite the possible dangers that his office has compiled during its three years of existence, Little emphasized that X-rays properly used, are both safe and important for the treatment and diagnosis of many diseases.

As examples of unsafe practices, Little cited these cases:

An X-ray machine placed next to a window overlooking a children's playground. "It can give a pretty high dose to that playground," Little said.

Fluoroscopes with radiation outputs so high that 5 minutes of treatment could give patients a case of radiation sickness.

New fluoroscopes purchased without shutters to focus the beam. Without shutters, the beam "splashes out," posing a hazard to the operator and exposing the patient to more radiation than he needs, Little said.

Failure to provide shielding for the operator of an X-ray machine. One physician who was told shielding was lacking refused to permit a follow-up visit.

"Some doctors say the inspections are a waste of time and taxpayers' money without compulsory regulations," said Little. "They are right in cases like this."

Little is working with an eight-member advisory committee of experts to draft the new regulation, which will be submitted to the District Commissioners along with data developed from inspections.

Safety limits will follow standards set by the National Bureau of Standards, Little

said. He also will request regulations to require that new X-ray machines meet safety standards when purchased.

Dentists, Little said, have registered "a tremendous improvement since 1962 when the U.S. Public Health Service conducted a survey in Washington.

"Dental facilities in the District are probably superior to those in the rest of the country," he said.

POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on August 29 it was my privilege and great pleasure to introduce our Postmaster General, Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien, to an audience of more than 1,100 Ohio citizens gathered in the ballroom of the Neil House, Columbus, Ohio, at a fundraising dinner under the auspices of the Democratic Executive Committee of Ohio. Postmaster General O'Brien's address may be regarded as the opening speech in the campaign to carry Ohio for President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY in 1968.

Mr. President, Postmaster General O'Brien is one of the truly great Americans of our time—the strong right arm and confidant of President Lyndon Johnson as he was of the late beloved President John F. Kennedy. As special assistant to both Presidents, he helped to guide through the Congress some of the most significant social and economic legislation in the Nation's history. As Postmaster General of the United States his achievements have been equaled by no one since Benjamin Franklin in colonial times, the first Postmaster General of the Thirteen Original Colonies. He has done more to bring the operation of the Post Office Department out of the horse and buggy era into this fast moving space age of change and challenge than any of his predecessors. Fortune magazine recently described Larry O'Brien as—

The best liked and most familiar Administration figure on Capitol Hill . . . A proud and competitive man . . . He came to the fray well-equipped, bringing the analytical mind and organizational skill that marked his previous electoral efforts . . . As Postmaster General, he is demonstrating not only unusual energy, but also a flair for modern management practices.

President Kennedy called him "the best election man in the business." And President Johnson describes him as "a wise counselor, gifted strategist, efficient manager, and warm humanitarian."

The Postmaster General made a truly magnificent address and time and again he was interrupted by resounding rounds of applause and at the conclusion of his speech he received a standing ovation from the audience.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to embody in the RECORD the address made by Postmaster General Larry O'Brien.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN AT A STATE DEMOCRATIC DINNER, COLUMBUS, OHIO, AUGUST 29, 1967

I have been listening intently to the previous speakers and I want you to know that I am happy to be here tonight at the start

of the 1968 campaign. We are going to win in Ohio.

The President asked me to give you his greetings and to say that from here forward, the Democratic Party must go on the offensive—as you are doing here in Ohio—must spell out the issues, must place our record before our fellow Americans and urge them to compare it with the empty record of the Republican Party here in Ohio and in the nation.

As an old campaigner, it is great to be here with you tonight. Certainly, I know the President considers this meeting of great importance to the Democratic Party, to the people of Ohio and to the nation.

From the several references made by the other speakers, I am also pleased to note that the Ohio Democratic delegation in the Congress will be substantially increased next year.

During the last seven years we have seen in stark contrast the record of the Democratic Party and the empty record of the Republican Party.

The record of the Democratic Party was expressed in the greatest surge of progressive legislation in any seven year period in the history of this nation.

The 89th Congress alone produced more legislation designed to meet the overriding, too long neglected issues of the day than any Congress in our history.

Think about it for a moment:

Medicare . . . Nuclear Test Ban . . . Elementary and Secondary Education . . . Higher Education . . . Peace Corps . . . Alliance for Progress . . . The Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs . . . Minimum Wage . . . Voting Rights . . . Social Security Increases . . . Veterans benefits . . . Truth in Packaging . . . Model Cities . . . Rent Supplements . . . Imaginative measures that increased our national income by over \$260 billion, a fifty per cent increase in seven years, the greatest record of economic advance in our history.

That is the Democratic record!

During the last seven years, in fact, all of the New Frontier Programs of John Fitzgerald Kennedy and 85 per cent of the Democratic Platform of 1964 have been translated from hope and aspiration into law and into solid accomplishments.

The record of the seven great Democratic years is clear.

And, the seven long years of Republican obstruction is, I believe, equally clear.

Our Democratic effort is to build. We know it and the people know it.

The opposition's record, their consistent record, is to delay, to denounce, to destroy—in Ohio or in the nation.

The Republican Party in power is important; the Republican Party out of power is the party of knee-jerk opposition.

And the irresponsibility of the Republican Party is not confined to frustrating measures needed at home. They strive to confuse the people about our response to aggression abroad.

Every day we hear of a new Republican policy toward Vietnam. One day a Republican spokesman seeks to bomb everything that moves in North Vietnam; the next day another spokesman says we are bombing too much.

It is our task to remind the American people, again and again, of the true nature of the President's policy in Vietnam. For in Vietnam, and throughout the world, the Democratic policy is one of seeking peace with honor, of assuring that we solve conflicts, not hide behind a temporary, patchwork truce. We will never back down on our commitment to prove that aggression does not pay, a commitment that has had much to do with holding the line in Laos, and in the Communist disaster in strategic Indonesia.

My friends, we seek peace; the President of the United States seeks peace. The Book

of Matthew says, "Blessed are the peace makers." Nothing is said about peace lovers. Any time, any place, the President is ready, willing, able, and anxious to resolve this problem with honor.

Turning to domestic affairs, we see that the Republican Eyewash Committee recently tried to play partisan politics with the nation's urban and racial crisis.

The Republicans clearly seek to make crime pay—in political terms.

But when it comes to action, when it comes to supporting the President's initiative in the Safe Streets and Crime Control Bill, the Republican Party shows its true colors: it takes action that would make this vitally needed legislation largely inoperative.

It is at this point that Republican and Democratic policies diverge sharply. It is truly a source of wonder how many Republicans think passing laws against riots will make them go away.

Actually, I am understating the case. For the record shows beyond a shadow of doubt that the Republican policy has been to frustrate, to oppose, to hinder every major effort by this Administration to remove the social combustibles on which riot and disaffection breed.

In contrast to Republican irresponsibility, opposition, blindness, and indifference, the Democratic program has been designed to meet the needs of all segments and sections of our country. The Democratic program recognizes that we have an unfinished agenda both in cities and suburbs, for the small businessman and the farmer, the student and the senior citizen.

No group, no race, no area has a monopoly on Democratic concern—because the Democratic Party and Democratic programs are designed for all the people.

We have been concerned about the plight of minorities and the needs of the majority, because we are the party that truly represents all of America.

Consider for a moment what seven years of Democratic leadership has meant to an American worker who lives in the suburbs; the man who pays his taxes, supports his church and community activities, hopes to send his children to college, seeks to take care of his aging parents, tries to save some money, and strives to pay off the mortgage.

Though no group has been neglected by our programs, we have failed in one area, we have neglected one task—we have failed to remind everyone equally of the enormous gains all have shared as a result of seven years of Democratic administrations. Let's look at some of these areas:

First. *Prosperity.* The suburban American, and all Americans, have a common stake in continued prosperity. When the Republican Administration was coming to an end, the nation was burdened by its third Republican recession. Our growth rate was the lowest in the free world—a mere 2.5 per cent. Since then we have entered the greatest boom in history.

Second. *Medical Care.* The American who lives in the suburbs is usually a highly responsible citizen. He pays his own way. Often in the past the cost of his parents' medical expenses, however, wiped him out or strapped him for years. Over Republican opposition—overwhelming opposition—the Democratic Party succeeded in getting legislation aimed at cleaning the tarnish of crushing medical bills from what should be the golden years.

Third. *Education.* The vast majority of Americans want their children to reach full potential through higher education. Because of Democratic programs and in spite of overwhelming Republican opposition, for the first time in our history, through the Higher Education Act of 1965, scholarships and loans and work opportunities and facilities, will be available for one million young Americans this year and every year who otherwise could not go to college.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued September 20, 1967
For actions of September 19, 1967
90th-1st; No. 147

CONTENTS

Accounting.....35	Foreign aid.....7,10	Public works.....36
Appalachia.....14	Fruits and vegetables...18	Purchasing.....39
Apples.....34	Grain reserve.....24	REA loans.....15
Appropriations.....2	Holidays.....30	Reclamation.....13
Containers.....18	Job Corps.....5	Recreation.....20
Cosponsors.....7	Lands.....16	Rural development.....3
Dairy indemnity.....27	Loans.....9,15	Rural life.....22
Data processing.....39	Marketing.....21,34	Rural water.....28
Education.....25	Mink imports.....33	Social security.....6,19
Employment.....17,38	Opinion poll.....31	Taxation.....12,29,38
Farm Bureau.....23	Organization.....4	Textiles.....7,32
Farm loans.....9	Personnel.....37	Water pollution.....8
Food stamps.....1	Poverty.....5,26	Wildlife.....11
Foreign agricultural aid.7	PPBS.....35	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to revised food stamp bill. House committee voted to report REA supplemental financing bill. Rep. Betts introduced and discussed bill to require status report on development of accounting systems to implement programming-budgeting systems.

SENATE

1. FOOD STAMP PROGRAM. Agreed to an amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 953, to authorize appropriations for the food stamp program. The revised bill authorizes \$200 million for the fiscal year 1968 and \$225 million for the fiscal year 1969 and provides that only appropriations made from the general fund of the Treasury for this specific purpose may be used to carry out the program. The House then concurred in the Senate amendment by a vote of 196 to 154. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S13245-6, H12120-3

2. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued consideration of H. R. 9960, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill. pp. S13232-3, S13236-61
3. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Bennett urged the enactment of S. 2134, the proposed Rural Job Development Act of 1967. pp. S13214-5
4. ORGANIZATION. Sen. Pearson spoke in favor of S. 47, to create a Commission on the Operation of the Executive Branch, to study the organization and functioning of the Federal bureaucracy for a 2-year period and make recommendations to Congress. pp. S13172-4
5. POVERTY. Sen. Jackson submitted an amendment to S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, to continue the present policy in the administration of the Job Corps program under OEO. pp. S13179-80
6. SOCIAL SECURITY. Sen. Hartke urged enactment of H. R. 12080, the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1967, and submitted several amendments to this bill. pp. S13180-1
7. COSPONSORS. Sen. Miller spoke in favor of S. 1796, to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles, and added his and Sen. Bayh's name as cosponsors of this bill. p. S13181
Sens. Clark, Inouye, and Bayh were added as cosponsors to S. 2273, to promote interest and training in international agricultural assistance, and Sen. Burdick was added as a cosponsor to S. 2348, to provide for a Great Prairie Lakes Parkway in S. D. and N. D. p. S13181
8. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Dirksen inserted a series of articles and reports which point out "the peril to health and public safety involved in pollution of the Great Lakes." pp. S13181-13207
9. FARM LOANS. Sen. McGovern inserted an FHA report on activities in S. D. since the inception of the program through 1966. pp. S13210-1
10. FOREIGN AID. Sen. McGee inserted an article, "Topics: What Foreign Aid Can and Cannot Do." p. S13214
11. WILDLIFE. Sen. Yarborough spoke in favor of S. Con. Res. 41, to provide for the setting up of an international conference on conservation of wildlife, and inserted an article, "Hard-Pressed Species can Survive if Buyers Take Profit out of Killing." pp. S13223-4
12. TAX SHARING. Received a resolution favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a Federal tax sharing program. p. S13175
13. RECLAMATION. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 845, to authorize construction and operation of the Neb.-Midstate division, Mo. River Basin project, and S. 6, to authorize construction of the first stage of the Oahe unit, James Division, Mo. River Basin project, S. D. p. D824

HOUSE

14. APPALACHIA. Conferees were appointed in both Houses on S. 602, to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. pp. H12120, S13233-6

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 324

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators MORSE, BURDICK, NELSON, and PROXMIRE, I submit an amendment to S. 2388 and request that it be printed. My amendment is as follows:

Amend section 106 by the addition of a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those enrollees are assigned to conservation centers, as described in section 107, or to other centers or projects where their work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, development, or management of public natural resources or recreational areas and is performed under the direction of personnel of agencies regularly responsible for those functions."

The purpose of this amendment is to continue the present policy in the administration of the Job Corps program under the Office of Economic Opportunity of insuring that at least 40 percent of male enrollees are assigned to conservation centers. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare when reporting the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 deleted this mandatory percentage ratio. This is regrettable to me and to all those who are interested in enhancing our Nation's conservation efforts. The success of the conservation centers has been amply demonstrated. They have provided many training and other benefits for our youth assigned to these centers as well as assisted the Federal agencies responsible for resource management in accomplishing much needed work on our public lands.

There are three types of Job Corps centers: conservation centers, urban centers for men and women, and demonstration centers. Actually, a conservation center or an urban center may also be a demonstration center. Currently, two conservation centers are also serving as demonstration centers; one demonstrating training in heavy equipment operation, and one demonstrating training in general educational development.

Eighty-three conservation centers are currently being operated by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, six by various States and one by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. On June 30, 1967, there were 16,046 enrollees in conservation centers, 16,177 in men's urban centers, and 275 in men's demonstration centers. About 50 percent of the male enrollees were in the conservation centers.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 required that any any one time no less than 40 per centum of the enrollees within Job Corps be assigned in conservation centers. This was later amended to 40 percent of the male enrollees. The administration's proposal, introduced as S. 1545, would have continued the requirement of not less than 40 percent of the male enrollees in conservation centers. The committee's report on S. 2388 states:

The requirement that at least 40 percent of all male enrollees be assigned to Conservation Centers is dropped in order to permit more flexibility in establishing demonstration centers.

An analysis of the situation shows the reasoning behind this statement is without merit. The bill would limit total enrollment to 45,000 during fiscal year 1968. Of this, at least 25 percent must be women. This leaves 33,750 spaces available for the men. Forty percent of 33,750 would be 13,500 spaces. Based on the June 30 enrollment of more than 16,000 in conservation centers, a 13,500 minimum requirement would leave 2,500 spaces at conservation centers which could be converted to demonstration centers. An equal number from men's urban centers would generate 5,000 spaces for demonstration centers. It is inconceivable that this number would be allocated to the men's demonstration center program.

I am concerned that dropping this requirement could permit a reduction in the conservation center portion of the Job Corps program and in the closing of some conservation centers. It is the opinion of many and in which I concur that conservation centers have been the most successful part of the Job Corps program. As the Senate is aware, Job Corps is a total youth development and rehabilitation program. It involves social adjustment, motivation, remedial education, vocational training, and the teaching of good work habits. Conservation centers have been taking the most deprived youths entering the Job Corps program, providing a comprehensive program and operating it for 20 percent less cost per corpsman man-year than urban centers. As pointed out in the report of the committee, direct operating cost for men's urban centers averaged just under \$7,500 as compared with \$6,100 for conservation centers.

Conservation centers are particularly good in bringing about social adjustment and motivation. They are small in size, ranging from 112 to 256 corpsmen per center. This allows for close enrollee staff contacts, for more individualized training and counseling. It provides a stronger socializing influence. The less complex setting of a conservation center provides fewer stresses, thereby enabling corpsmen to devote their energies to learning. It removes disadvantaged youth from undesirable urban neighborhood environments and influences.

Firm discipline has been maintained in conservation centers since the start of the program. This discipline and the small size are reflected in the substantially fewer adverse incidents which have happened in conservation centers than urban centers.

Relationships with nearby communities have been excellent in almost all cases. Local communities have been involved in center activities through community relations councils, and have repeatedly assisted in overcoming any community difficulties which have arisen. In many cases, corpsmen have assisted local communities in times of disasters, such as tornados, fire, and flood.

Conservation centers have been taking the least educated youths entering Job Corps. Almost all enrollees who cannot read at the seventh-grade level have been assigned to conservation centers. About 35 percent of the corpsmen entering conservation centers cannot read or write. An additional 40 percent read and

write below the fourth-grade level. The rate of mathematics gains in conservation centers has been 1.5 times better than the public school norm, and the rate of reading gain is 1.25 times better. These gains are a 250-percent improvement over the average rate these corpsmen experienced in public schools. The average stay per corpsman at the conservation centers has been 5.7 months as compared to an overall Job Corps tenure average of only 4.3 months. Approximately 10 percent of the corpsmen initially assigned to conservation centers go on to enroll in an urban center; this step generally being taken when the corpsman's reading level has improved to the point he can read the various technical training manuals. These educational gains are slightly less than at men's urban centers, but when you consider the selective assignment practice which has given conservation centers the lowest achievers, these education gains are remarkable. The educational gains at conservation centers are much greater than at women's centers.

Vocational training in conservation centers takes place primarily in an on-the-job situation. The result is that conservation center graduates are receiving practical training and are learning how to work. They have been taught good work habits. In many vocations such as carpentry, welding, masonry, cooking, truck driving, heavy equipment operation and other outdoor activities, the centers are giving in-depth vocational training. The on-the-job training these young men are receiving cannot be duplicated in the large urban centers. Through construction of roads, trails, campground facilities, buildings, landscaping, and wildlife projects, Job Corpsmen have contributed \$32,000,000 in conservation work benefits through July this year. The several hundred conservation center corpsmen assigned to fighting forest fires in the recent fire disasters of the Northwest turned in top-notch performances.

As evidence of the success in vocational training in conservation centers, all 50 corpsmen recently completing training in heavy equipment operation at one center have been placed with an average wage of \$3.25 per hour. These are graduates from the heavy equipment operator training program at the Jacobs Creek Job Corps Conservation Center located on the Cherokee National Forest in eastern Tennessee. Here the International Union of Operating Engineers assisted the U.S. Forest Service and the Office of Economic Opportunity in conducting the training program. Training consisted of operation and maintenance of dozers, compressors, road graders, scrapers, and high lifts. Corpsmen carried out the field portion of their training by constructing roads on the Cherokee National Forest. This is the most outstanding placement success story of the entire Job Corps program to date.

In summary, the conservation center program is highly successful. We should be assured it will continue to represent a major part of the male Job Corps program. The amendment I propose will assure this and will not curtail the successful creation and operation of new

demonstration centers. I urge the adoption of my amendment when the Senate considers this important legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

**SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT:
\$100 MINIMUM, 20-PERCENT IN-
CREASE—AMENDMENT**

AMENDMENT NO. 325

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the basic purpose of benefits provided under social security is to give a modest minimum of income to recipients so that they will be able to maintain some semblance of life and dignity in their declining years. It is for this purpose that millions of people make their contributions to the system through tax withholding.

Today, as people have come to the end of their working life and become retired, there are millions receiving benefits toward which they have contributed. The first payments made under the law in 1937 came to only about a million dollars. By 1947, 10 years later, they stood at \$463 million, and by 1965 the total of payments was more than \$18 billion.

That is a lot of money. But it has all come from the contributions poured in as we have expanded the system to cover more and more people. The really significant thing is the per capita figure. Are people today receiving an adequate sum as compared with current wages and cost of living? Has the system provided benefits keeping up with the advance in the economy, in which gross national product has grown from \$90 billion in 1937 to \$740 billion in 1967?

The obvious answer is that on a comparative basis, as a proportion of lost income, or as a suitable share of the vastly increased affluence of America, the elderly beneficiaries are suffering wherever it is necessary to depend on their social security benefits as their source of income.

The facts are familiar. It is not necessary to labor the point that the largest single group of those in the "poverty" category, as a percentage of the total, are the elderly. According to a Census Bureau release of August 14, those in "poverty" comprise 15 percent of the population. But that figure is far below the percentage of elderly within the category. Of "unrelated individuals," the largest group of whom are the elderly living alone as widows or widowers, 37.4 percent are poverty stricken, as compared with 10.1 percent of those in families—white individuals and white families, that is. The comparable figures for nonwhites are 49.9 percent of those who are not in families and 40.8 percent of those who are. Although this is not my present point, it deserves note that these latest figures show poverty four times as prevalent in nonwhite as in white families.

But the point I make is that nearly four times as many among "unrelated" persons—and more than that among the elderly—are in a poverty-stricken situation. The increase in benefits recommended by the President, to a minimum of \$70 per month and a general 15-per-

cent increase, was not enough. Now we have a House-passed bill which gives a minimum of only \$50 a month and a 12½-percent increase.

These sums are pitifully small to meet the need. Therefore, I am today submitting an amendment which would provide minimum payments of \$100 per month to the individual—\$150 per couple—and an across-the-board benefit increase of 20 percent.

I think no one can quarrel with the need and the desirability of such a provision. The question which will be raised is that of cost. I have dealt with that in a previous amendment, No. 313, presented on September 13 and discussed on page S12889 of the RECORD. There I called for holding the contribution schedule at present levels, with the Federal Treasury contributing as necessary to the trust funds, with the goal of eventual three-way financing between employee, employer, and the general fund.

But there are, in this proposal, some offsetting gains not only socially—they are more obvious—but economically. Title XIX of the social security law provides for matching payments devoted to old-age assistance as well as other categories of welfare. There are hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of social security beneficiaries who are unable to make the grade economically on that low income—an income which the present bill would do so little to cure. They must, in order to maintain their existence, apply for additional old-age assistance payments and are thereby subject to all the indignities which our welfare investigation system involves.

My proposal for a 20-percent increase with \$100 minimum—and I have been furnished these figures by the Social Security Administration—would completely remove a half million elderly beneficiaries from the old-age assistance rolls. It would reduce payments, and, therefore, partially remove from the OAA rolls another 350,000 elderly for a total of 850,000 persons. Both of these results, of course, are predicated on the assumption that the added social security benefits will be passed along to the beneficiaries, not absorbed by the States as offsets to their own OAA payments. This I am attempting to deal with in a separate amendment.

The direct offset in OAA payments would amount to \$504,000,000, of which \$325 million would be the Federal share and \$179 million the State and local share. In addition there is the indirect offset of reduction in the numbers of persons in the program, hence of the numbers of caseworkers needed in the structure. This in itself would be a very sizable amount.

But above and beyond the financial question there stands the human question. Today we have millions of persons living in poverty in their old age, at the end of a long and useful life in which they have served society and paid their dues to it, so to speak. Now society lets them live not only in poverty but in the spiritual degradation which poverty enforces, \$100 a month for an individual is still only \$1,200 per year, and the Bureau of the Census sets the poverty

level for a single individual over 65 at \$1,500 per year. For an elderly couple, the sum of \$1,800 per year is likewise below the very small minimum fixed as the poverty line for a couple over 65, which stands at \$1,900. They are still, when this is their sole income, below the poverty level.

Mr. President, we need this increased benefit. The House bill is not enough. The President's proposal is not enough. The Hartke amendment is not enough but it comes closer to meeting the need. At least, we can and we should come closer to eliminating the poverty of old age with the means we have at hand in the existing social security system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 325) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

**SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT:
HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS
FOR THE DISABLED—AMEND-
MENT**

AMENDMENT NO. 326

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, social security law has long contained special benefits for those who, having become qualified for benefits, become disabled and thereby unable to continue their worklife. The long official name is now Old-Age Security, Disability, and Health Insurance—OASDHI. The "H" was added when we provided the additional benefits of health insurance—medicare and medicaid.

Predictably, the disabled are apt to require more medical attention than the ordinary person. The same, of course, is true of the elderly, and that, coupled with the low income of the retired, was a principal compelling reason for the passage of the health insurance provisions.

The disabled, even though they may before disablement have acquired full social security coverage of 40 quarters in covered employment, are handicapped as a rule both by the physical disability and by the economic disability which has relegated them to being recipients of disability benefits. True, many disabled are in excellent health except for their impairment, and they require no greater medical service than the rest of us. But for those whose disability involves a chronic condition occasioning hospitalization from time to time, perhaps successive operations, or frequent X-ray, laboratory, or other attention, the cost can mount to sizable sums. These sums, given the income of a person who is subsisting on disability payments under OASDHI, can be a deplorable added handicap to that his physical condition imposes.

Therefore I am submitting today an amendment to H.R. 12080 which would provide health insurance for those who receive disability benefits, just as it is provided for those who receive old-age benefits. Their need is comparable, their income from the social security system is comparable, and the cost is minimal. Yet for those who need this additional

Sept. 21, 1961

13. FARM LABOR. Rep. Gubser stated "evidence continues to mount that one of the principal thrusts of the poverty program in California and one of the principal causes benefited by antipoverty money is the outright unionization of farm labor." pp. H12337-9
14. OPINION POLL. Rep. Battin inserted the results of a questionnaire including items of interest to this Department. pp. H12333-4
15. GREEN THUMB PROGRAM. Rep. Thompson, N. J., inserted the speech made by John Reed, a Green Thumb member, while presenting a Green Thumb award to Secretary Freeman. p. H12342
16. DONABLE PROPERTY. Rep. St Germain commended the Federal donable property program and inserted a resolution of appreciation from the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property. pp. H12349-50
17. FARM BUREAU; COOPERATIVES. Rep. Resnick said President Shuman of the Farm Bureau Federation was scheduled to testify in favor of S. 109 (relating to trade practices affecting cooperatives) but later declined to do so. Rep. Resnick stated that the bill in its present form is opposed by USDA and three major farm organizations, while it is supported by the Farm Bureau. He said Mr. Shuman is also president of the National Food Conference whose interests are "directly opposite" from those of the farmers. pp. H12316-17
18. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that on Tues., and the balance of next week there will be considered the Fire Research and Safety Act bill, a continuing resolution, packers and stockyards bill and the bill for the relief of industries and workers injured by imports from low-wage areas. p. H12310
Rep. Albert and others discussed the problems of scheduling legislative business. pp. H12311-12
19. ADJOURNED until Mon., Sept. 25. p. H12362

SENATE

20. CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT. Passed as reported S. 852, to authorize cost-sharing for recreation and fish-wildlife purposes in RC&D projects. This bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to bear (1) Part of the cost of installing public fish and wildlife or recreational developments in so-called resource conservation and development projects authorized by section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and (2) Not to exceed one-half the cost of the land, easements, rights-of-way, and minimum basic public facilities needed in connection with any such public fish and wildlife or recreational development. At present Federal assistance under section 32(e) is limited to planning assistance and loans. Grants are not authorized for installation assistance. pp. S13374-5
21. RICE ALLOTMENTS. Passed without amendment S. 2195, to provide that, if the farm marketing excess of rice determined for any farm is delivered to the Department, such farm would be considered to be in compliance with farm acreage allotment for such year. p. S13375

22. RESEARCH LAND. Passed without amendment H. R. 472, to authorize the Department to purchase certain research land from Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Tex. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S13375-6
23. FARM INCOME. Sen. Long, Mo., stated, "We must keep up the fight side by side with the farmer to help him achieve a fair income," and inserted a speech by Secretary Freeman on this subject. pp. S13396-8
24. RECLAMATION. Sen. Moss spoke against the proposed Central Arizona project bill in its present form and inserted a resolution in support of his position. pp. S13385-6
25. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 77-5, with amendments H. R. 9960, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill and conferees were appointed (pp. S13419-48). House conferees have not been appointed. This bill includes items for the Office of Emergency Planning, Office of Science and Technology, Civil Service Commission, General Services Administration, Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Interstate Commerce Commission, Selective Service System, Securities and Exchange Commission, Veterans Administration, and Department of Housing and Urban Development.
The subcommittee completed consideration of H. R. 11641, the public works appropriation bill. p. D836
26. FEDERAL SPENDING. Sen. Proxmire spoke in favor of his bill S. 2032, which would "set up a Government commission to evaluate programs from the point of view of cost effectiveness and would decide as to which programs should be discontinued, as well as the relative priority of various public programs." p. S13387-8
27. AIR POLLUTION. Sen. Muskie inserted an editorial, "The Battle for Clean Air," and his letter commenting on this editorial. pp. S13388-9
28. RESEARCH. Sen. Scott commended the approval of the amendment to H. R. 9960, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill, which would restore the budget estimate of the National Science Foundation and inserted an article, "University Basic Research." pp. S13398-400
29. POVERTY. S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, was made the unfinished business. p. S13448
30. TRANSPORTATION. A subcommittee of the Commerce Committee approved for full committee consideration S. 1314, to broaden the definition of the term "bulk commodities" under the Interstate Commerce Act. p. D836
31. METRIC SYSTEM. Sen. Pell inserted an article, "Is Congress Going to Forget All About the Metric System Again?" pp. S13407-8

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

32. URBAN AFFAIRS. Rep. Denney inserted an editorial, "Crisis in the Cities: Rural America's Role." pp. A4723-4

during the amount of grant or loan to the individual.

The first \$1 million will finance construction of more than 100 units. It is a small but important beginning.

I am confident the Senate conferees will work hard to convince House conferees to accept this addition to the bill the House approved. I know that they carry with them the hopes of thousands of the poorest Americans.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE EDWARD WATSON SHORT, M.R., POSTMAS- TER GENERAL, UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are honored this afternoon to have with us as a guest of the Senate the Right Honorable Edward Watson Short, Member of Parliament and Postmaster General of the United Kingdom.

Mr. Edward Short was appointed Postmaster General in July 1966. Prior to this appointment, he served as Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury and, as such, Government chief whip in the House of Commons, since the Labor Government returned to power in October 1964, at which time he was also created a privy counselor. Mr. Short had had many years experience in the whips' office, as deputy chief opposition whip and earlier as an opposition whip northern area. He has been Labor Member of Parliament for Newcastle Central since 1951.

Many Members of the Senate attended the British parliamentary meeting at Bermuda some years ago and met and remember Mr. Short. We are pleased to have him on the floor this afternoon. I will ask him to rise in order that he may be welcomed. [Applause, Senators rising.]

COMPENSATION FOR DISABLED FIREMEN—CHANGE OF REFER- ENCE OF BILL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, S. 2421, a bill to provide compensation for totally disabled local firemen or survivors of local firemen killed or disabled while performing their duties in an area of civil disorder, was introduced on September 18 and was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

I am persuaded that the bill should go to the Committee on the Judiciary which handled a similar bill for compensation for policemen killed or injured under such circumstances.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for handling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRI- ATIONS, 1968

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to take just half a minute before we vote.

This is the 13th year that I have been handling the independent offices appropriation bill as chairman of the subcommittee. It is the 9th year that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has been the ranking minority member of that subcommittee. It is 19 years for Mr. Earl Cooper, 3 years for Mr. Harley Dirks, of the committee staff, and 5 years for Mr. Robert Clark, of the minority staff.

We want to pay great respect to these members of the staff for their help on this difficult bill.

The net reductions that have been made in the budget requests for these 13 years that I have served has amounted to \$4.4 billion.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I merely want to express my appreciation to the chairman for his comments. This is a complicated and difficult bill, and it has been a great pleasure to work with him.

I wanted to express my appreciation to the members of the staff, Mr. Cooper and Mr. Dirks, and to Mr. Robert Clark, the minority staff member, because, without their assistance and diligence and hard work, it would be impossible to bring out such a bill.

Now I would like to speak politically for a moment and suggest that we vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on passage of the bill. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senators from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE and Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN].

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 264 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Aiken	Fulbright	Mondale
Allott	Griffin	Monroney
Anderson	Gruening	Montoya
Baker	Harris	Morse
Bartlett	Hart	Morton
Bayh	Hartke	Moss
Bennett	Hayden	Mundt
Boggs	Hill	Murphy
Brooke	Holland	Muskie
Burdick	Hruska	Nelson
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pell
Carlson	Javits	Prouty
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Ribicoff
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smith
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, La.	Spong
Dirksen	Magnuson	Stennis
Dodd	Mansfield	Talmadge
Eastland	McCarthy	Tydings
Ellender	McClellan	Yarborough
Ervin	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Fong	McIntyre	

NAYS—5

Hickenlooper	Miller	Williams, Del.
Hollings	Thurmond	

NOT VOTING—18

Bible	Hatfield	Russell
Brewster	Kuchel	Scott
Cannon	Lausche	Smathers
Dominick	Metcalf	Symington
Gore	Pearson	Tower
Hansen	Percy	Williams, N.J.

So the bill (H.R. 9960) was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the funding measure just adopted provides appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and independent offices, including the Office of Emergency Planning, the Federal Communications Commission, the General Services Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and many more. The funds provided will support the continuation of a number of programs vital to the health and welfare of millions of Americans; medical research, urban rehabilitation, housing, mass transportation, model cities development, Federal facility construction, and rent supplements, identify only a few of the many benefits enabled by the funds provided.

Handling an appropriation bill of such magnitude—containing so many varied and extensive programs—was an immense task. But the challenge was easily assumed and effectively met by the distinguished chairman of this Appropriations Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. The success of the measure, the adoption by the Senate of all of its features—some of which were highly controversial and complex—was due in large measure to his strong and devoted efforts. Always has Senator MAGNUSON lent his talented and most effective abilities to matters of such great value and immense importance; always have his efforts been highly productive and most successful. That certainly was the case with respect to this measure. His work in the service of the Nation has today produced another outstanding achievement; an achievement that demonstrates once more that Senator MAGNUSON is a legislator whose effectiveness is unsurpassed in this body. The Senate is again deeply grateful for his efforts.

Joining Senator MAGNUSON to insure the Senate's overwhelming approval of this measure was the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. His deep understanding of the issues presented, his thorough knowledge of all of the many facets of this appropriation, have made his contribution as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee critical to this success. Though offering a differing view with respect to some of its features, Senator ALLOTT cooperated strongly to assure the disposition of the measure with reasonable dispatch. The Senate is deeply grateful.

The Senate is grateful also for the splendid cooperation exhibited by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] during the consideration of this funding bill. He expressed his own strong and sincere views, yet in no way impeded efficient and orderly action. High commendation goes also to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. His appreciation of the issues involved and his articulate and thoughtful contributions to the discussion—as always—were most welcome.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] deserves similar high praise for so quickly responding to an emergency situation by successfully advocating his amendment designed to help mitigate the devastating effects Hurricane Beulah has already visited upon his State. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] must be credited with outstanding advocacy for the successful urging of his amendment increasing funds for the National Science Foundation.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] are to be commended for offering their clear and thoughtful views on the proposal. And similar commendation goes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

In sum, the debate on this measure was highly provocative. Many Members joined the discussion, and while the views offered were not entirely homo-

geneous at all times, the debate certainly was in keeping with the already established fact that the U.S. Senate is the greatest deliberative body in the history of mankind.

The overwhelming passage of this appropriation measure is a credit to the entire Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for tomorrow and early next week, and whether a Saturday session is proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first in response to the last part of the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, there will be no Saturday session.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 548, S. 2388, a bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, and so forth. I do this so that it will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill—S. 2388—to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of the economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there may be a little discussion on this bill tonight. There will be no votes.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the military construction authorization bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services. If it meets with the approval of the distinguished minority leader, I wish that he would give consideration to permitting us to lay aside the pending business tomorrow to take up the military construction bill, which I understand has been reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will discuss the matter with the distinguished minority leader later.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That will be agreeable.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think I can state with assurance to the Senate that the military construction bill will come up for consideration at the conclusion of the morning hour or shortly thereafter tomorrow.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the

two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9547) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of September 14, 1967, p. H11863, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill passed by the Senate contained one amendment—relating to disapproval of any loans that might be used for arms purchases—which was not in the House version of H.R. 9547. The House accepted this one Senate amendment in the conference.

H.R. 9547 as approved by the House contained two amendments not carried in the Senate version of the bill. One of these amendments, designed to take account of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, provides that any dollar financing of local costs should be held to a minimum. The Senate conferees accepted this House amendment. The other amendment, entitled "audit," met with strong objections; after considerable discussion the House conferees receded from their amendment.

Yesterday, however, the House, by a vote of 274 to 126, recommitted the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on retaining the "audit" section of the House-passed bill. It was made quite clear that there would be little or no room for maneuver leading to a possible compromise. It was also clear that if the Senate conferees had acted in an equally adamant fashion, there would probably have been a long deadlock which might have jeopardized the whole purpose of the legislation. Believing that the amendment at issue is neither important nor significant enough to warrant risking this contribution to the Alliance for Progress, the Senate conferees have accepted section I of the House bill.

Frankly, Mr. President, it is my belief that no real case has yet been made for this audit provision. The highly reputable Price Waterhouse Co. has been auditing the internal auditing procedures of the Inter-American Bank and has no criticism; nor has there been any criticism of Price Waterhouse. It has been claimed by supporters of this amendment that only the Bank's social progress trust fund is really of concern to us, because it consists entirely of U.S. money. Yet this amendment applies to the Bank as a whole.

Stranger still are the actual provisions of the section. It provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall tell our repre-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Sept. 25, 1967
For actions of Sept. 22, 1967
90th-1st; No. 150

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....9	Disasters.....5	Poverty.....1,11
Appropriations.....6	Interest rates.....4	Price support loans.....7
CCC.....2,7	Loans.....5,7	Rural life.....3
Claims.....8	Military construction....2	Spending.....4
Credit.....10	Personnel.....8	Truth-in-lending.....10

SENATE

1. **POVERTY.** Continued debate on S. 2388, proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. pp. S13510-20
Sen. Yarborough inserted a speech, "Should the War on Poverty be Continued?" pp. S13520-1
2. **MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.** Began consideration of H. R. 11722, the military construction authorization bill, which includes authorization of appropriations for payment on the debt to CCC for foreign currencies used in prior years by the Defense Dept. for foreign military family housing. The yeas and nays for passage were ordered for today, Sept. 25. pp. S13487-13506
3. **RURAL LIFE.** Sen. Mondale commended Mrs. Johnson for her trip to rural areas of the mid-west and for her remarks on the "virtues of rural living." He also inserted one of her speeches made on the tour. pp. S13478-9
4. **SPENDING.** Sen. Proxmire criticized the benefit-cost ratio used by Congress to determine the economic feasibility of public works projects and inserted an article, "The Interest Rate Applicable to Government Investment Projects." pp. S13466-72
5. **DISASTERS.** Sen. Yarborough discussed the recent flooding in Tex. caused by Hurricane Beulah and pointed out some of the federal programs, including the emergency credit revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration, designed to bring relief from natural disasters. pp. S13472-3

6. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee completed work on H. R. 10345, 1968 appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies. p. D842
7. CCC LOANS. Received from GAO a report on savings available if the CCC recovers interest costs on repaid price-support loans and on storage facility and equipment loans; to the Government Operations Committee. p. S13452
8. PERSONNEL. Received from this Department a report on claims settled under the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964 for the period Sept. 1, 1964, through June 30, 1965, and for fiscal 1966 and 1967. p. S13452
9. ADJOURNED until Mon., Sept. 25. p. S13526

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. CREDIT. Extension of remarks of Rep. Sullivan explaining certain provisions of the proposed truth-in-lending bill, and inserting a broadcast editorial on this subject. pp. A4750-1
11. POVERTY. Rep. Brademas inserted an article, "Poverty Programs and Workers Vital to Keeping Cities Cool." p. A4751

0

COMMITTEE HEARING SEPT. 25:

Poverty program, H. Education and Labor (exec).

oOo

JULY 17, 1967.

Mr. JOSEPH HARRIS,
Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party,
Sunflower, Miss.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: Thank you for your letter of July 30. All of the staff energy and financial appropriations of NCNP at this time are being devoted to the national convention at which we hope the MFDP will be well represented. I have sent a request to our Chicago office and asked Mike Wood, the convention coordinator, to be in touch with you. If there could be some cooperative effort relating your project to our convention organizing, I would encourage it and have suggested that Mike negotiate it.

Thanks so much.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. PEPPER.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, files of the National Conference for New Politics contain a card index of so-called key contacts in various States. Under "Mississippi," two names are listed in this index. David Doggett is listed twice, once with the address "Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.," and again with the address "In care of Freedom Information Service, Box 120, Tougaloo, Miss." Also listed is John Buffington, 461 Cottrell Street, West Point, Miss.

Files of the NCNP also contain a "list of names and/or groups" designated as "those which have so far registered as representatives for the convention, donated money to the NCNP, or who have either recently joined the NCNP or contributed money."

A note heading this "list of names and/or groups" states that—

Regardless of their affiliation, they are all in support of the policy of NCNP. All pertinent information regarding each individual or organization was taken verbatim from their own credentials and reports. Each applicant listed sent a minimum of \$5 membership or registration fee and will attend as a delegate, observer, or representative (from a Congressional district) as indicated.

Item 57 on this "list of names and/or groups" is "Friends of Children of Mississippi, 507½ North Farish Street, Jackson, Miss. 39202." Under this heading, two individuals are listed as delegates. They are Frederick R. Mangrum, Jr., designated as "director," and Dave Fleming, listed as "deputy director." Under the heading of "Miscellaneous Information," this entry shows that the organization "Friends of Children of Mississippi" was formed on January 18, 1967, and has 435 members.

A so-called credentials report of the Convention of the National Conference for New Politics dated August 31, 1967, carries a headnote that—

The following is a list of all the organizations credentialled for delegate status up to the present, with notations for groups which the Credentials Subcommittee is querying for future determination of their status.

In this report, groups are listed in one column, with a second column showing either the number of persons allegedly "credentialled," or a question mark. Under the subhead "Mississippi," the following are listed:

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Child Development Group of Mississippi..... | (?) |
| 2. Freedom Democratic Party, A.C.B.C..... | 400 |
| 3. Freedom New Brick Co..... | 50 |
| 4. Friends of Children of Mississippi.... | 435 |

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 5. Hinds County Mississippi F.D.P..... | 150 |
| 6. Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party..... | (?) |
| 7. People's Corp..... | (?) |
| 8. Sunflower County Improvement Association..... | (?) |
| 9. Tougaloo College Political Action Committee..... | (?) |

Mr. President, I would like to call particular attention to one of the organizations listed as being accredited by the Credentials Subcommittee of the National Conference for New Politics.

The Child Development Group of Mississippi is apparently accredited to send delegates to conventions of the NCNP. This organization is one of the most heavily funded of the Federal poverty programs. It has already received and is scheduled to receive for the current calendar year \$7 million. The preceding year it received \$4,700,000, and the year before \$1,500,000, making a gross total of \$13,200,000 in Government money that has gone to this organization. I will say it has gone over the protests of the entire congressional delegation from Mississippi, and this same group was subject to an investigation by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for illegitimate use of funds and for shortages in substantial sums. Members of this same group were likewise investigated by the Department of Justice for excessive activity in the recent Mississippi elections and charges that many Negroes were terrorized and abused by members of this group in connection with these elections.

I am greatly concerned that an organization heavily funded by the Federal Government and supposedly dedicated to the education of children and adults to combat poverty should be involved with a national organization apparently infiltrated by the Communist movement.

According to the exhibited documents, one of the purposes of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party in attending the NCNP convention was to submit a budget to solicit the aid of the member organizations in raising funds.

It is only logical to assume that if an organization such as the Child Development Group, of Mississippi, which handles millions of dollars in Federal funds, is called on through its membership to raise money, they might be in a tempting position to make a handsome contribution.

In fact, I understand it has been discovered that the Child Development Group of Mississippi has more than a half million dollars in expenditures which cannot be accounted for.

I think we should ask where this Federal money has gone.

I am including for the Record a copy of the Hinds County Chapter of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party newspaper of September 8, 1967, which further illustrates the type of politics being generated by the National Conference for New Politics. This newspaper lists as delegates to the Chicago meeting of the NCNP Henry Hatches, Ralph Wheeler, and Louis Clark of Hinds County. On the front page of this publication is a fully illustrated diagram on the construction of a Molotov cocktail, which is labeled "New Politics." The publication describes the activities of the delegates

at the convention with emphasis on black power and how to run a successful revolution.

Three letters from Arnold Johnson, public relations director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and one letter from Daniel Rubin, national organization secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., are contained in the NCNP convention files.

Under date of July 24, 1967, the public relations director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., addressed a letter to Mr. Michael P. Wood, chairman, convention steering committee, National Conference for New Politics, making formal application for participation in a steering committee meeting. In this letter, Johnson described himself as "a member of the National Board of the Communist Party, U.S.A." and stated that he has "a responsibility in the areas of political action and peace as well as in the total field of politics."

Johnson also stated, in this letter, that he has been active "on the leading Committees of the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam and more recently, on the Spring Mobilization Committee and its continuing work."

On the same date, July 24, 1967, Arnold Johnson addressed a letter to William Pepper, executive director of the National Conference for New Politics, enclosing a copy of his letter to Michael Wood asking for accreditation at the steering committee meeting of the NCNP, and suggesting that he have a preliminary meeting with Pepper.

One day later, July 25, 1967, the public relations director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., addressed another letter to Michael Wood, chairman of the convention steering committee of the National Conference for New Politics, enclosing a copy of the Communist paper, the Worker, of July 16, 1967, and calling attention to an editorial in that paper dealing with the New Politics Convention. In this letter, the Communist Party's public relations director also expressed his confidence that the chairman of the NCNP Convention steering committee would be "interested in the section of Gus Hall's report to a recent meeting of the Communist Party which deals with the question of political action."

On August 11, 1967, Daniel Rubin, national organization secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., addressed a letter to Mr. Michael P. Wood, chairman of the convention committee, National Conference for New Politics, listing six individuals as having been elected as delegates of the national committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., to attend the Convention of the National Conference for New Politics. The six listed delegates were Arnold Johnson, Claude Lightfoot, Gilbert Green, Roscoe Proctor, Thomas Dennis, and Mike Zagarell.

In this letter, the national organization secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., stated that—

We have designated our delegation as representative of our National Committee of 80 members so as to avoid any concept that we are seeking to influence the Convention

by the voting strength of our total membership throughout this country.

Then he continued:

Arnold Johnson and Gilbert Green will be in Chicago from August 28th to attend any preliminary meetings, and to confer and cooperate on all matters in which we may have an interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the four letters to which I have just referred, three signed by Arnold Johnson, public relations director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and one signed by Daniel Rubin, national organization secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 24, 1967.

Mr. MICHAEL P. WOOD,
National Conference for New Politics,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. WOOD: In the "New Politics News" with all the information on the forthcoming convention there is a notice that "deadline for application from groups and individuals wishing to be accredited at the July 29-30 Steering Committee meeting is July 28th. On this basis I assume that you are accepting applications and I trust that you will consider this letter as an application to attend and be accredited at the July 29-30 meeting.

As to a bit of information, I am a member of the national board of the Communist Party, U.S.A. and have a responsibility in the areas of political action and peace as well as in the total field of politics. I have been active on the leading committees of the National Coordinating Committee to end the War in Vietnam and more recently, on the Spring Mobilization Committee and its continuing work.

In the past I was the district organizer of the Communist Party in Ohio from 1940 to 1947 during which time I ran for School Board in Cleveland in 1943 and received some 47,000 votes and in 1945 when I got some 60,000 votes. I have also run for other offices.

I became the National Legislative Director of the Communist Party, USA in 1947 and since then have been on the staff of the national office of the Party except for a brief 3-year sentence under the Smith Act from 1955-57.

I make this application to participate in a Steering Committee meeting in an individual capacity with the understanding, of course, that my organizational affiliation is with the Communist Party, U.S.A.

I trust the above information is sufficient and that you will let me know the time and place of the Steering Committee meeting by air mail.

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD JOHNSON.

NEW YORK.

JULY 24, 1967.

Mr. WILLIAM PEPPER,
National Conference for New Politics,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. PEPPER: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have just sent to Michael Wood as an application to be accredited at the Steering Committee meeting this coming weekend. I trust that this will receive favorable consideration and if it is at all possible to see you before that date, I would appreciate an appointment, although I can also recognize that you must be very, very busy.

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD JOHNSON.

NEW YORK.

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.
New York, N.Y., July 25, 1967.

MICHAEL WOOD,
National Conference for New Politics,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. WOOD: I am enclosing herewith a copy of the *Worker* of July 16th because I feel you should have directly from us the editorial on the New Politics Convention, as well as other references to the call to your Convention contained in this particular issue.

I trust that you will also be interested in the section of Gus Hall's report to a recent meeting of the Communist Party which deals with the question of political action.

I am also sending a copy of this to William Pepper.

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD JOHNSON,
Public Relations Director.

COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.,
New York, N.Y., August 11, 1967.

Mr. MICHAEL P. WOOD,
National Conference for New Politics, Chi-
cago, Ill.

DEAR MR. WOOD: In accord with the purposes of the Convention as outlined in the Call to the Convention and the Rules and Procedures as presented in "New Politics News", the following have been elected as delegates of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A. to attend the Convention: Arnold Johnson, Claude Lightfoot, Gilbert Green, Roscoe Proctor, Thomas Dennis and Mike Zagarell.

While we are confident that our policy and activities which can be documented by many publications does not need extensive elaboration, yet we are enclosing copies of pamphlets which can be used for reference.

We have designated our delegation as representative of our National Committee of 80 members so as to avoid any concept that we are seeking to influence the Convention by the voting strength of our total membership throughout the country.

Arnold Johnson and Gilbert Green will be in Chicago from August 28th to attend any preliminary meetings, and to confer and cooperate on all matters in which we may have an interest.

Trusting that this is satisfactory and awaiting a favorable reply, I am

Sincerely yours,

DAVID RUBIN,
National Organization Secretary.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have said that I would not prejudice possible future hearings before the Internal Security Subcommittee by attempting to draw conclusions from the documentation I have presented here, but would only ask a few obvious questions.

My questions are these:

In the face of this evidence, who can doubt the cooperation between the Communist Party and the Conference for New Politics?

Who can doubt the cooperation between the Conference for New Politics and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, and the other Mississippi organizations and individuals referred to, or the participation of those organizations and individuals in the convention and activities of the NCNP?

Who can doubt that the political activities of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party are in furtherance of the general objectives of the National Conference for New Politics; or, to put it another way, that these political activi-

ties of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party are a part of the drive to bring about Negro revolution in this country?

How much of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's budget of more than \$140,000 for political operations in Mississippi during the second 6 months of 1967 has been supplied, either directly or indirectly, by the Communist Party or by organizations or individuals connected with or influenced by the Communist Party?

How much of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's budget for its operations during 1968 will be similarly supplied?

How much is the National Council of Churches going to contribute to the activities of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party or for its operations?

I hope, Mr. President, that the Internal Security Subcommittee will hold public hearings on the National Conference for New Politics and its activities, and that these hearings will supply positive answers to these questions, and to similar questions applicable to other areas of the country where the black power movement is making itself felt.

We are approaching a crisis in this country, where it will be determined whether law and order is to triumph over revolution and anarchy, whether black power is to be substituted, either in the country as a whole or in any of our States, for normal and peaceful political processes; and whether the Communist Party, U.S.A., is to be permitted to grasp the reins of political power through the machinations of the National Conference for New Politics and other cooperating organizations.

Unless we meet this crisis with firmness and resolution, unless we free ourselves from an attitude which renders immune from criticism, and even immune from investigation, any organization or activity which chooses to wrap itself in the banner of so-called civil rights, this Nation may not awake to the realities of the situation until it is too late; and if the Communists are permitted to attain their objectives, the loss to all the people of this country, including the minority for whose alleged benefit the forces of revolution have been set in motion, will be irredeemable.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending bill, S. 2388, is known as the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

This is an original bill, prepared initially by the Subcommittee on Employment Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The subcommittee considered at some length the administration bill, and held

extensive and quite unusual hearings, to which I will advert in a moment.

The purpose of the bill is twofold: First, to modernize, streamline, and bring up to date the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; and, second, to add thereto an emergency employment program, occasioned by reason of the disturbances in some 30 cities across the country this year—disturbances which resulted in an almost unanimous consensus of informed opinion that while there is no simple solution to the complex social problems and disorders which plagued so many of our cities this spring and summer, one thing is superabundantly clear, and that is the vital necessity to give useful employment to minority groups, both in rural and urban areas, old as well as young, but more young than old, who all too frequently have tended to be the ringleaders in those distressing violations of law and order which have caused so much concern, not only all over our country, but to friends of the United States all over the world.

Let me briefly refer to the preliminary work which has resulted in bringing this bill to the floor.

Last year, when I had the honor to floor manage the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, there was great criticism from Senators that there had not been an adequate study in depth of the poverty program, which had then been in effect somewhat less than 2 years, having been passed in the late summer or early fall of 1964. Last year, we held only 4 days of hearings, listening mostly to administration witnesses, but also giving, to a brief and somewhat inadequate extent, an opportunity for other interested citizens and organizations to be heard.

When I brought the bill to the floor last year, I made a commitment that before we moved to the floor of the Senate with the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty would undertake to study the poverty program in substantial depth, so that when we came back with the legislation this year, the members of the subcommittee would know a great deal more about the program than they did last year, and would have made available, to other Senators and to the public generally, the results of a searching congressional investigation or inquiry into the poverty program.

On February 20, 1967, the Senate, through the Committee on Rules and Administration, authorized the subcommittee, in effect, to undertake a thorough examination of the war on poverty.

When we instituted that examination, I stated categorically that the inquiry would be neither a whitewash nor a witch hunt. I stated that we wanted to find out what was wrong with the legislative aspects of the war on poverty and the administrative aspects, too, in order that we might repair some of those deficiencies.

I also stated that we wanted to find out what was right about the administration program and the legislative guidelines which had been set down for regu-

lating the conduct of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its extremely able Director, Mr. Sargent Shriver.

In the performance of those commitments, the subcommittee has conducted 33 days of public hearings in Washington and around the country. We heard 401 witnesses. Their testimony took 144 hours. We received countless statements for the record. We made 11 inspection trips in the field all over the United States.

I have been in the last 6 months to Jackson, Miss., Phoenix, Ariz., Albuquerque, N. Mex., San Francisco, Calif., and to the San Joaquin Valley in California to study the migrant program and rural poverty. I have been not only to Jackson, Miss., but also from there north to the Tennessee border, investigating and taking testimony with respect to abject poverty in the Mississippi Delta counties. I have been to Johnstown, Pa., Chicago, Ill., and New York cities.

My colleagues frequently accompanied me and, in order appropriately to share the burden, conducted hearings, at which I was not present, in Boston, Mass., Providence, R.I., and Sparta, Wis.

We studied in some depth poverty in the District of Columbia, including a couple of field trips. We retained a consultant who made separate investigation of the administration of the poverty program in each of the seven regions into which the Office of Economic Opportunity is divided for administrative purposes in the United States.

Each of those seven consultants studied five areas, city or rural areas, in each of those regions. So, we have 35 separate consultant reports on poverty programs in 35 communities in the seven regions.

We have also received 18 staff reports from consultants who studied various aspects of the organization, administration, and implementation of the poverty program. For example, they studied seven State technical assistance agencies involving a sample of the program in 26 States. They interviewed more than 1,000 persons.

Six other consultants wrote special studies for the committee, with particular concentration on statistical analyses of the manpower program.

The subcommittee's effort is contained in 18 volumes of hearings and eight volumes of consultant and staff reports, the more important of which are presently looming high on the desk of every Senator.

At this stage the committee is ready to report on the first examination of the poverty program. We deal with the Economic Opportunity Act, its operation and what legislative changes should be made.

The report which accompanied S. 2388, therefore, encompasses both the findings of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty and the committee's legislative recommendations as contained in the reported bill.

Here is a copy of the report which is also on the desk of all Senators. I think I can say with accuracy that this is an unusually comprehensive report, including as it does 223 pages of findings of fact, conclusions, and recommendations.

Included in the report are minority views signed by all six members of the Republican minority which, generally speaking, commend the Economic Opportunity Act and its administration, and take credit—appropriate and just credit—for many changes made in the bill at the behest of the minority, and list those changes, eight in number.

In addition, there are supplemental views filed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], to which I take grave exception, and with which I will deal in detail later on during the debate.

There are also supplemental and somewhat differing views of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], with which I also find myself in substantial disaccord.

There are supplemental views of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], with respect to which I regretfully make the same comment.

There are extensive supplemental views of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], very well conceived views if one accepts his point of view—which I do not—but views which will have to be met in the course of the debate if those of us in the majority are to carry the burden of pressing this bill to enactment in the Senate.

Mr. President, I have spoken on what has taken place so far in our investigation and of what is contained in the report currently available to Members of the Senate. However, a second and final report will deal in a more general way with the total array of Federal programs affecting the poor, for we must remember that only a small part of the funding in the war on poverty is encompassed in the Economic Opportunity Act amendments which are presently before the Senate.

As the President pointed out in his comprehensive message some months ago dealing with urban and rural poverty, approximately \$25 billion of Federal funds are in the budget this year for programs which have a direct impact on poverty, but only less than \$2 billion is directly under the administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The remainder is in such areas as primary and secondary education, including technical and vocational education; manpower training of many kinds; health programs; higher education programs; welfare programs; the vast array of programs to help the poor which, from time to time, have been authorized by Congress and are presently being administered by a host of Federal agencies.

On the basis of the examination which the committee has made to date, we have come to five general conclusions.

First. The magnitude of poverty in America continues to be a serious national problem and deserves continuing national attention. The United States has experienced steady progress in the reduction of poverty for 30 years, and this progress has accelerated since the inception of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I should point out that the first real poverty programs began in the early days of the New Deal, in the administration

of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Two of the programs achieved the greatest "notoriety."

One was the PWA program—the Public Works Administration—which put millions of Americans then out of work to work on useful public works projects, the results of which shine out in grandeur all over the United States today and bear living testimony to the wisdom of President Roosevelt and his administration.

The second program was known as the WPA, or Works Progress Administration, subject to strenuous criticism at the time, sneers about men leaning on shovels and raking leaves. Very little public recognition was given to the spiritual value of that program in saving the souls as well as the bodies of millions of Americans. As an example, some of the finest art that came out of the thirties was painted and sculpted by artists who did not know where to look for the next meal, in view of the massive unemployment of those days and the fact that there were no longer any rich people to buy the product of their labor. Some of that art will live in history. This is just one example of the overall benefit which the WPA program achieved.

So I say, Mr. President, that the war on poverty has been going on now for the better part of 35 years; and yet, today, almost 30 million Americans are still poor. Who are the poor today? They comprise about 11 million households. About 12½ million of the roughly 30 million poor, 43 percent of the total, are children under 18—far too many of them living in homes without a man at the head of the household, far too many of them illegitimate children, far too many of them children in families so large that one wonders how their mothers can support them on the meager welfare grants which are available in many States.

At least 1,500,000 of the poor are young adults between the ages of 19 and 21. Most of them by then are out of school. Most of them are unable to find jobs because they do not have the technical qualifications which only a liberal arts or a technical or a vocational education could give them, to enable them to obtain useful employment.

Five million aged Americans are impoverished. Eight million additional Americans are saved from the quicksands of poverty only by their usually totally inadequate social security benefits. About 5,700,000 of the latter are 65 years of age or over.

The second conclusion to which the committee has come is that the basic programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act are desirable and should be continued. However, the experience of the last 3 years has shown a number of ways in which administration can be improved and how the legislation can be strengthened. The committee's report proposes a number of administrative improvements, and the reported bill embodies the committee's legislative recommendations. In many instances, it seemed better to put the recommendations in the RECORD in order to give adequate flexibility to the administering agency. In others, it seemed wise to the

committee to write the recommendation into the proposed legislation. This has been done, and this is one reason why we were unable to accept the administration bill and decided, as a result of our extensive study, that we would bring in a clean bill.

The third point we make is that the Office of Economic Opportunity has been an essential national instrument for focusing attention on the problems of poverty, for serving as an advocate for the poor within the Federal Government, and for conducting and overseeing a number of useful programs.

Let me expand a bit on the third point. Whitney M. Young, Jr., the executive director of the National Urban League, testified before the subcommittee:

Destruction of the Office of Economic Opportunity would turn out to be the destruction of the most ambitious innovative and imaginative program the Nation has ever undertaken to help the poor become self-sufficient.

We considered carefully in our deliberations—I should say, Mr. President, that we had eight executive sessions, each of which lasted a couple of hours or more—such questions as: Is the Office of Economic Opportunity necessary? Is it desirable to have a separate agency in the Executive Office of the President as the command post for the war on poverty? Or should the OEO be abolished and all its functions turned over to other Federal agencies? A majority of the committee determined that the answer to that question should be "Yes"—OEO is necessary. It should not be abolished. Its programs should not be spun off.

During the course of the coming debate, amendments will be proposed to spin off a number of the OEO programs to other conventional bureaucratic agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I use that word "bureaucrat" in no invidious sense, for every agency of every department which has more than a few Government employees is a bureaucracy; some are good, some are bad, and most are indifferent.

However, the majority concluded that it would be a mistake to spin off any of these programs and that Mr. Young was correct that it would be a serious mistake to eliminate the OEO. Most of the minority disagreed. They think, for example, that the vastly successful Headstart program should be transferred to the Office of Education. They think the same of the embryonic Followthrough program, which is an effort to carry youngsters, who have successfully met the challenge of Headstart, through the first couple of years of school so that the benefit of the Headstart program would not be lost in utterly inadequate schooling sometimes provided in many of our States for the first, second, and third grades, particularly in the urban and rural slums, where, the record shows, without peradventure of doubt, that the child of a slum family starts behind and falls further behind the longer he or she stays in school. One of the major efforts of the poverty program must be to see that that does not happen. In the opinion of the majority of the committee, the way to keep it from happening is to keep

OEO's finger on the tiller, where it is now. Because of OEO and the poverty program this Nation has begun to come to grips with poverty problems.

OEO has placed poverty in the public spotlight and it has served as a rallying point for a broad spectrum of our citizens who want to eliminate poverty—businessmen, labor union officials, religious leaders, State and local officials, social welfare professionals, minority group leaders, and hundreds of thousands of plain citizens and, most of all, the poor themselves.

OEO has been an experimenter, an originator of pilot projects, a designer of new programs which have the potential for solving problems of poverty. If OEO were abolished its unique contribution could not be duplicated by any other agency. Worst of all, the poor, whose hopes have been raised, would feel a deep sense of repudiation.

The time may come, and the time will come within the foreseeable future, when the administration of the poverty program will have been such a success, and local school boards will have become so fired with the idealism inherent in programs like Headstart and Follow Through, that it will be administratively sound and wise to transfer these programs to other governmental agencies.

However, there is a strong feeling by the majority of the committee that that time has not yet come. When it does come, and I hope it comes soon, I shall be the first person to advocate the transfer.

I should point out, Mr. President, that it is only in relatively rare instances that the OEO itself actually administers the programs which some persons presently desire to have spun off.

In the usual instance the OEO delegates to the older and more conventional bureaucracy the actual operation of the program, but by retaining a finger on the paycheck and by setting standards which it insists shall be complied with as a condition to receiving a Federal grant, OEO, without bringing up a bureaucracy all its own, is able to control standards of operation by others of programs that some presently desire to spin off.

The view I have just expressed is not merely the committee's point of view. This may surprise many of my colleagues. It is the opinion of nearly every witness who appeared before the committee at its hearings throughout the country, both poor and nonpoor, both white and Negro, Spanish-American and native Protestant.

Of all 400 witnesses, only two advocated abolishing OEO and the transfer of its functions to other agencies. Not one witness recommended termination of the programs under the Economic Opportunity Act.

I should say here that those 400 witnesses were not, as is intimated in one of the minority reports, carefully selected and screened individuals with a preconception of Mr. Shriver and his organization. We heard everybody who wanted to be heard. I pleaded with the minority to bring in their own witnesses. Every now and then they did. This was no whitewash, but I say again, neither was it a witch hunt.

Nevertheless, OEO's contribution to American life has not been without difficulty. We found a lot of things wrong with OEO. There are a lot of things that are still wrong with OEO today and it is only very recently, indeed, that the agency has begun to achieve sound internal management. Let us remember that the OEO Act was passed in the late summer of 1964. It was in many ways a jerry-built organization. It was put together with scotch tape and baling wire.

Mr. Shriver was called out of the Peace Corps and was given two hats to wear, one for the Peace Corps, and one for the Office of Economic Opportunity. He had to put together an organization almost overnight, and it is a great tribute actually that the first grants were made by OEO in November of 1964, only 5 weeks after the appropriation for the agency was approved.

Mr. Shriver and his assistants had a great feeling of urgency. They wished to launch an all-out attack on poverty, and they did. Within the limitations inherent in the time and organization of the agency, in my opinion, they have done overall an excellent job with some exceptions.

Let us remember that most Federal agencies take from 3 to 6 months, and sometimes as long as a year, to get a new program underway.

Much of the early application review was done by the senior staff which made policy decisions on an ad hoc basis as issues arose. This worked well for awhile. By the summer of 1965 the process was beginning to bog down and that is when the criticism began to buzz. Much of that criticism was justified. Some of it is still justified. But under the whiplash—if I may say so—of the subcommittee, an alert press, and the keen interest taken by community action agencies all over the United States in the program—many of them very critical, indeed, of the administration of the OEO—the administration of the program has been steadily and constantly improved until, in my opinion, today it is at least as good, if not better, than that of many far more seasoned Federal agencies.

For example, it was not until January of 1966 that a joint management survey team of Federal officials assigned to develop a better organization and more effective procedures went into action. There was a 6-month delay in initiating the improvements. That is a source of some of the difficulty which is still plaguing the OEO.

This interagency team presented its report in June of 1966 and by now virtually all of its 68 recommendations have been put into effect.

In the 15 months since June of 1966, OEO has carried forward a process of administrative decentralization in seven regional offices. The view of the subcommittee in its hearing, and in studies by its experts, is that most of the current administration difficulties come into focus in these regional offices. There has been, on the one hand, too much delay and redtape in passing on requests for funding from local community action programs which go to the regional offices and sometimes have to be submitted to Washington for final approval.

There has been too much delay in Washington getting back to the regional offices, and the regional offices, in turn, getting back to the local community action agencies and other local groups administering a part of the poverty program.

The final decision was as to whether—and if so, how—the request for funding was to be granted. Based on a year-long study by McKinsey & Co., Inc., retained by Mr. Shriver and his organization, OEO is presently reorganizing its regional offices and is instituting a series of uniform procedures which, if properly implemented, should remedy many of the difficulties.

I think the subcommittee can take some credit for having pressed the OEO to move effectively in that direction.

In short, the committee has found that the administrative practices of the OEO have shortcomings. The committee, however, is also convinced that the shortcomings can be, and are being, remedied. As these defects are taken care of, OEO will be in a much better position to serve as the command post for the poverty program and lead the way to achievement of the goal which President Johnson has held up to the American people.

THE ELIMINATION OF THE SCOURGE OF POVERTY

Mr. President, to summarize again the third point, our third general conclusion is that the OEO has been an essential national instrument in focusing attention on the problems of poverty by serving as an advocate of the poor within the Federal Government, and for conducting and overseeing a number of useful programs.

The OEO should, therefore, continue in operation under the changes recommended, administrative and legislative changes both, as recommended in the report and in the bill.

At this point, I think it would be helpful to quote from President Johnson's message to Congress entitled "America's Unfinished Business; Urban and Rural Poverty," wherein he says:

We have recognized that public housing, minimum wages, and welfare services could not, standing alone, change the bleak environment of deprivation for millions of poor families. A successful strategy requires a breakthrough on many fronts—education, health, jobs and job training, housing, public assistance, transportation, recreation, clean air, and adequate water supplies.

The basic conditions of life for the poor—

Said the President—
must and can be changed.

The fourth major conclusion to which the committee came was that one of the major, unsolved problems of the poverty program is the lack of sufficient coordination among the wide variety of programs which serve the poor.

This problem exists at the Federal, State, and local levels, and in layers between these layers.

Accordingly, the reported bill contains a number of proposed remedies for the difficulties, remedies we thought to be necessary to put in the legislation and in the report because of our strong view that one of the weaknesses in the administration of the program was in the area of coordination.

Thus, I should like to direct a few words to the subject of coordination and explain what the bill and report do in this regard.

George Niccolo, commissioner of the community development agency in New York City, who testified before the subcommittee, told us,

It is difficult enough to plan programs involving multiple funding sources, but when a number of Federal agencies do not plan together, it becomes almost impossible to plan essential multiple funding projects.

When the President announced unconditional war on poverty in the United States in January of 1964, he defined that war in terms of the concerted use of all the weapons at the Government's command, and all existing programs with an impact upon the problems of the poor, plus new programs to be enacted. As the new programs, which eventually became the OEO Act of 1964, were developed, two organizational possibilities were available.

First, these programs could be assigned to existing agencies, to be administered in coordination with existing programs relating to the elimination of poverty.

Second, they could be assigned to the new agency which was being set up in the executive office of the President as the command post for the war on poverty in the OEO.

The former alternative was chosen for six of the 10 new programs; that is to say, they were assigned to existing agencies. These programs were the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the college work-study program, the adult basic education program, rural loans, small business loans, and work-experience and training.

Except for this latter, work-experience and training, which was assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, statutory responsibility was placed in the Office of Economic Opportunity, but delegated by the Director to existing Federal agencies; and to those I referred a few moments ago.

In the case of the college work-study and adult basic education, the programs were later transferred by statute.

The four remaining original programs were assigned to OEO for direct operation, including the two that were the most complex, innovative, far reaching, and costly—the Job Corps and the community action programs, VISTA, or Volunteers in Service to America, and the migrant labor program.

While most of the Economic Opportunity Act dealt with the authorization of the 10 new programs, four sections were included to provide a statutory basis for OEO's role as Government-wide coordinator across-the-board—meaning programs which were never remotely in OEO but were part of the overall war on poverty—programs embracing general education and college work; that is to say, sections 604, 611, 612, and 613 of the act.

These sections specifically charge the OEO Director with "coordination of antipoverty efforts by all segments of the Federal Government." That is section 604. In the same section a Cabinet-level Economic Opportunity Council, chaired by the Director, is created to assist him.

Section 611 empowers the Director to obtain data and reports from other agencies regarding their antipoverty programs and directs them to cooperate with him.

Section 613 authorizes the Director to establish an information center on all Federal antipoverty programs and to make information available to States and communities.

Section 612 directs all agencies, within limits of feasibility and legal authority, to give preference to projects which are elements of approved community action programs.

All this, of course, deals with coordination at the Federal level.

At the community level, the community action agency was designed as a mechanism with a coordinating role analogous to that of OEO at the Federal level.

The community action program would, in the language of existing law (sec. 202(a)(1)), "mobilize" and "utilize" public and private resources in the attack on poverty, as well as provide direct services.

There are presently over 1,000 of these local community action agencies. I would be less than candid if I did not say some of them are better than others. Some of them are working splendidly. Some of them are working badly. Most of them are working, in my opinion, pretty well, all things considered; and I am confident that they are working better every day, as constant supervision over administration at local, State, and national levels is constantly improving.

We must remember the very difficult coordinating problem that exists when, for example, a Headstart program is put underway in, let us say, a Pennsylvania community, or in any community in any State in the Union. Theoretically, the Headstart program is under the jurisdiction of the local community action program. This means that the community action agency has to get an authorization for funding out of Washington.

That application has to go first to the regional office of OEO. Then it goes to the top office for approval, except to the extent—and this is becoming more and more the case—where authority has been decentralized, under very strict guidelines, to the regional office to make the decision, subject to the right of appeal.

Having gotten the money, then the local community action agency has to go to the local school board and hope to find it sufficiently cooperative, as in many instances it is, but in many instances it is not, so that it will provide classroom space and teachers to take on the Headstart project. And when the local school board either cannot or will not cooperate, then, as I have seen with my own eyes in places in Mississippi and elsewhere, the community action agency has to find some public-spirited citizen or citizens who will find some shack or some abandoned dwelling, or frequently make available their won dwelling, where the program can be conducted, and also has to find the individuals adequately qualified—and it does not take a trained psychiatrist to run a Headstart program—to take care of the kids.

But this is only a part of it, because one of the great benefits of the Headstart program is the involvement of parents in this work. Many of these children come from the homes of illiterate parents. In many of these homes there has never been a book. In many of these homes there is only the most rudimentary understanding of measures of public health and sanitation. So the coordination of a program like this is a very difficult one.

I have not mentioned the States, because in many States, although not all, because the laws are so different, the State superintendent of education would have something to say, and so would the State welfare commissioner and the State department of health.

I make these comments only because of the desirability of indicating the immense complexity of the coordinating task and because OEO is assigned the formidable task of organizing new programs of unusual difficulty and sensitivity. Because of this task, the agency adopted a conscious strategy of dealing with the coordination of other antipoverty programs only as that became necessary to the implementation of the programs for which it was responsible.

This was probably a good short-term decision, but it was an impossible way to run an agency on a long-term basis.

This became apparent once the programs got well underway and the need for further coordination was understood. Nevertheless, OEO does list a number of accomplishments in its capacity as coordinator. It is the view of the committee that these are real accomplishments and that the OEO has good reason to be proud.

First, it has developed, for internal use only, a national antipoverty plan, projecting for 5 years recommended funding levels for antipoverty programs throughout the Government and proposing new programs and program modifications.

I may say that, in what I consider personally to be an utterly unjustifiable exercise of executive privilege, the Director of the OEO, under instructions from higher authority, refused to make that 5-year program available to the committee. In the bill, we require him to do so. How effective that will be with higher authority in the light of present rulings on executive privilege, one may perhaps leave to the imagination. But we do not want it to be said on behalf of Congress that that kind of information which has nothing whatever to do with the national security should not be made available to every Member of Congress.

The second achievement in coordination is that OEO has stimulated and taken a leading part in discussions of basic questions of policy, such as income maintenance proposals—this, as Senators know, being what was considered a good many years ago a far-out suggestion that we should substitute for current welfare programs a proposal or a program under which every man, woman, and child in the United States should receive a minimum allowance for subsistence.

In my view, we are a good long way from that. The time may come—and it will come unless we can bolster up our present welfare and social security sys-

tems to take far better care of the almost 30 million impoverished citizens with whom we are dealing today.

The third achievement in coordination is that, through technical assistance grants, it has provided each State with an agency, usually located in the Governor's office, which has the potential for dealing with a wide range of State and Federal-State functions.

The fourth achievement is that, through grants to community action agencies, it has encouraged the formation of broadly based agencies which in many communities are contributing to the coordination of Federal assistance programs at the receiving end. It has negotiated "checkpoint" procedures with Labor, HUD, and agencies of HEW to assure that applications for aid under their programs are submitted for comment to community action agencies.

The fifth achievement in coordination is that OEO has encouraged and funded projects, such as neighborhood centers, which have a special potential for mobilizing and coordinating community resources.

This, Mr. President, is a very great achievement in coordination at the local level, and will be immeasurably assisted by the bill we passed yesterday, which gives to HUD a substantial amount of money to acquire neighborhood community facilities in which community action agencies can conduct their neighborhoodwide program, bringing under one roof, as I saw done in Phoenix, Ariz., this spring, all the multiple agencies dealing with welfare, health, education, job placement, and a score of other programs which bring badly needed services to the poor.

This sixth achievement in coordination is that OEO has combined its funds with assistance from other agencies, such as the Department of Labor, to undertake joint projects. This is a real achievement in a Federal bureaucracy, with all the jealousies which usually afflict inter-agency projects. OEO has been able, not only with Labor but with HEW and to some extent with HUD, to work out joint projects where they do the job together, without too much concern for who is going to receive the ultimate credit.

The seventh achievement is that the OEO has established an information center with data, county by county, on 160 programs.

The dissemination of this information all across the country, available to all 1,000 community action agencies, results in a spread of knowledge to make the most successful projects available for consideration by many other agencies. This is a very real achievement.

I point out as an example the opportunities industrialization centers, organized first in Philadelphia by that inspired Baptist minister, Rev. Leon Sullivan, which have had fantastic success in training the poor for useful employment, with the assistance of private industry which helps with on-the-job training. As our testimony shows, this was not only a fantastic success in Philadelphia, but as a result of the dissemination of information of which I have been speaking, similar programs have been instituted in 45 other cities.

We know they will not work in all 45, and the reason is that this kind of project requires inspired leadership of the type which Dr. Sullivan has so amply given. Where that kind of leadership can be obtained, it is going to work, and it is working in many another city.

The eighth achievement in coordination is similar to the one I have just outlined. It is the publishing of a "Federal Catalog of Programs for the Improvement of the Community and the Individual." In its information and training centers, the OEO has sought to cover the whole range of Government antipoverty activities, and make all of that information available in every community.

I might say that in Johnstown, Pa., I saw a U.S. Employment Service agency carrying on this antipoverty work under an inspired local director, and making all of these programs available to the wide range of the poor in both rural and urban Cambria County, Pa. This was a magnificent, splendid example of the collection, evaluation, and dissemination of useful information.

The final achievement in coordination is that the Economic Opportunity Council has organized multiagency projects to deal with problems of displaced farmworkers in the Mississippi Delta, problems of Indians on reservations, and consumer programs. This I have seen with my own eyes both on an Indian reservation in New Mexico and in the delta counties of Mississippi.

But not all is well in connection with coordination. There is much that is not good at all. For that reason, the subcommittee is recommending a number of changes in legislation and in administrative practices.

There remain very serious problems. Many of these show up, not in Washington, but at the local level, where the services are actually delivered. A constantly recurring theme in the subcommittee's field hearings and consequent study is the complaint of lack of effective coordination among Federal programs. I see that the able senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is in the Chamber. I point out to him that Gov. John A. Volpe of Massachusetts, observed that coordination is paramount among the problems which have made themselves apparent in the operations of the antipoverty program.

One of the committee's consultants documented the interagency difficulties of following through on the President's speech made in Syracuse, N.Y., on August 19, 1966, calling for "the establishment in every ghetto in America of a neighborhood center to serve the people who live there." However, not until June of 1967, 10 months later, were any grants made, and these only for planning of pilot projects in 14 cities.

The committee has itself experienced the frustrations in dealing with several agencies on crucial problems of this sort as it has tried to stimulate the Department of Agriculture, the Public Health Service, and the Office of Economic Opportunity to respond quickly to the problem of hunger in America, which the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and I saw so graphically before us in the inspection trip we made on a long, hot

day in the Mississippi Delta country. This problem I know exists also in areas in Appalachia as well as in many urban ghettos.

It is so difficult to get these old-styled, entrenched bureaucracies off their rear-ends, if I may be mildly vulgar. We started at the top and worked down. Finally we got some action. However, it was like trying to pour molasses outdoors in the middle of winter in Vermont.

Coordinated activities would help. However, in the opinion of the committee, section 612, which requires other Federal programs to give preference to components of community action programs, has been found unworkable in any literal sense because community action agencies usually do not develop comprehensive programs embracing programs funded outside of the Economic Opportunity Act.

As I pointed out earlier, only about one-tenth of the programs dealing with poverty in America in terms of funding are within the coverage of the Economic Opportunity Act or the Office of Economic Opportunity. And this is because other Federal agencies are generally unwilling and not disposed to honor the preferences which are established pursuant to section 612. Even the preference provision for programs funded by the OEO Act, and this is section 212, has little application. The OEO has substituted the checkpoint procedure to achieve the same objective.

The Economic Opportunity Council has been a useful forum for communications among Federal agencies and for discussion of some relatively minor problems of coordination on an ad hoc basis, but it has not served, in the opinion of the committee, as an effective tool for concerted action with coordinated followthrough. In this respect, it has the same weaknesses that we have seen so often in other interdepartmental committees.

If we are going to try to coordinate programs among various Federal programs, or State or local agencies as I know from my experience as mayor, there has got to be a coordinator with enough power to require coordination.

Mr. Shriver, sitting on this Interagency Committee as Economic Opportunity Director, presumably speaks with the voice of the President because he is located in the Executive Office of the President.

Try to tell that to the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, or to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who sit in the Cabinet and consider themselves to some extent the superior, if not the peer, of the estimable gentleman who happens to have the titular right to say that he is in the Executive Office of the President in the White House.

So we have made a number of legislative recommendations to improve coordination. To start with, with respect to coordination at the Federal level, the committee bill completely rewrites part B of title VI of the original act, which deals with Federal coordination. It revises the Economic Opportunity Council, which is section 631, to provide the President a more versatile tool which he can use in assuring that Federal antipoverty efforts

are well coordinated, for ultimately only the Chief Executive has final jurisdiction in resolving interdepartmental difficulties.

The bill does not name any specific members of the Council other than the Director of the OEO, but rather permits the President to designate whom he chooses from time to time and to appoint the Chairman. It gives the Council far stronger powers than at present, including the following ways in which he can assist the President:

First, it provides for coordination of Federal programs and activities related to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Second, it develops basic policies and sets priorities with respect to such programs and activities.

Third, and this is important, it resolves differences arising among Federal departments and agencies with respect to such programs and activities.

Fourth, it initiates and arranges for the carrying out of specific actions or projects designed to achieve the objectives of the act.

As important as these new powers is the creation of a full-time Executive Secretary with his own staff to serve the Council and to follow through on Council actions. He would be a level 2 executive appointed by the President, similar in rank to the Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

This is done by giving the same authority as the President himself possesses while permitting him full power to delegate authority by creating a full-time staff with loyalty to the Council, as opposed to administrators lent on a part-time basis by existing agencies.

The committee hopes that coordination at the Federal level can be substantially improved.

The bill contains additional provisions to achieve this result. It requires the Director of OEO to conduct continuing studies and evaluations, to identify problems of coordination, and to propose solutions. That is section 632.

It requires Federal agencies to cooperate with the Council and the Director, and it authorizes the President to direct agencies to carry out programs and functions in conjunction with the poverty program. That is section 633.

It encourages combinations of Federal projects and programs. That is section 634.

It sets forth procedures for joint funding. That is section 612.

Thus, it builds into the legislation itself procedures which have been used in some instances, and used pretty satisfactorily, for achieving these results, in the hope that, by giving a legislative mandate, the coordination will be vastly improved.

The legislation contains and expands the role of the information center. That is section 635.

It retains a provision of the original act which prohibits duplication of functions. That is section 636.

It retains a previous amendment designed to achieve greater coordination of manpower training programs. That is section 637.

I must say parenthetically that one of the things that concerned the subcommittee the most was the inadequate

coordination of manpower programs. We saw in Greenfield, Miss., for example, relatively illiterate Negroes being taught under the Manpower Development Training Act to read and write.

It was hoped that after a year of this effort, they would achieve a level of fifth-grade education. Yet, the MDTA told us that unless one had a 10th-grade education, there was no job available anywhere in the county or, indeed, anywhere in the region.

We found young women being trained to be nurses' aides in a State which refused to accept Negro girls as nurses' aides.

So, there is a lot to be done in coordination in this area.

To give long-range perspective to coordinated Federal efforts to combat poverty, the bill requires the Director to prepare a 5-year national poverty action plan. That is section 632, subsection 3.

This plan should consider alternative periods of time in which poverty in America could be eliminated and should estimate Federal and other governmental expenditures and also contributions of the private sector necessary to achieve these alternative goals.

This plan should encompass all Federal programs related to the elimination of poverty, without regard to whether they are administered by the OEO, and should indicate what new programs might be necessary.

I say again, as I said earlier, that this plan is in existence. But they will not show it to the committee. They will not show it to Congress. I say again that this exercise of executive privilege, to my way of thinking, is unjustifiable and untenable.

One other means of coordination—the use of delegation powers—remains unchanged from existing law—section 602(h). Although the Director delegated six of the original 10 programs to other Federal agencies, the initial delegation orders contained no built-in controls which would assure coordination. However, new manpower programs, added last year—Nelson-Scheuer, and the Kennedy-Javits special impact programs—were delegated to the Department of Labor, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps was redelegated. This time the delegation instrument was broader in its scope and established a firm foundation for program coordination. One of the reasons the committee is opposed to the statutory transfer of programs from OEO to other agencies is that the delegation route offers a much higher potential for establishing an effective system of coordination.

Mr. President, for a brief moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

2. STATE COORDINATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I now turn to the question of State coordination.

The original act provided two roles for the States. The first was technical assistance, and all of the States established technical assistance agencies—although Indiana has since discontinued its agency. These agencies have been useful instruments in getting poverty programs started, especially in rural communities. The second role was the right of a Governor to disapprove projects, subject to an override by the Director for programs under titles I-B and II provided by a 1965 amendment. These were the Neighborhood Youth Corps and community action programs. This veto has been used 15 times during the first 3 fiscal years of the act, and the Director's override has been used twice. In an unknown number of instances the threat of the Governor's veto has led to the modification of a local program.

The committee has concluded that the roles given the States are too limited. The Governor's veto is essentially a negative role, and technical assistance, while useful, does not go far enough. Yet, a few States, such as New Jersey and Massachusetts, have shown that the States can potentially make a significant contribution to the poverty program. This is especially true for the coordination of Federal programs which are channeled through State governments and for programs which the States themselves finance.

Therefore, the committee bill allows the Director to provide financial assistance to State agencies not only for technical assistance but also to assist in coordinating State activities related to the poverty program. It would be up to a State to embark upon such coordinating efforts, but OEO could help finance the operation. These functions could be carried out for both the community action program—section 231—and the work and training program—section 129. The bill also gives the States a role in advising the Director of OEO and the Economic Opportunity Council. It allows for joint funding of certain projects which combine State and Federal funds and retains the Governor's veto in the same form as existing law—sections 114, 231, and 810.

The question of the Governor's veto is a vexing and controversial one. I know that many Senators on the other side of the aisle believe that it should be reinstated in full force. I know that my able colleague, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], feels very strongly that the Governor should not have an ultimate right of veto; and I have no doubt there will be a lively controversy about that matter on the floor of the Senate before the matter is finally determined. The committee has indicated its view in support of Senator YARBOROUGH's position.

3. LOCAL COORDINATION

Program coordination is not an end in itself but only a means to an end. Coordination provides a means of dealing with complex, interconnected problems in their totality and of serving program participants as whole persons. In this perspective, the most important locale of coordination for the poverty program is at the community level where the poor live and work. Therefore, Federal and

State programs must be organized to facilitate, not impede, local coordination.

The committee has concluded that the key to effective local coordination is the existence of a capable local agency with jurisdiction broad enough to deal with a variety of programs and with sufficient leverage to mobilize community resources. One of the best ways to obtain such leverage is through control over the allocation and expenditure of funds, such as those which come to the community under the Economic Opportunity Act.

This observation has led the committee to propose that the community action agency should be perceived as a prime sponsor for receiving and allocating community action funds—section 210. As prime sponsor it would not be expected to operate all programs directly but instead would channel funds to delegate agencies. But in determining what programs would be funded and by attaching conditions to the expenditure of funds, the community action agency would be in a position to bring about coordination. This, in fact, is what the most effective community action agencies are already doing, and this approach should be extended. As a planning and coordinating body, the community action agency would be required to adopt a systematic approach to the implementation of programs and the utilization of funds—section 220(b).

I point out that the concept here is to reduce authority to the lowest possible level as close as possible to the poor themselves. It is the view of the committee that the community action agencies in these thousand communities are far better able to deal with the wide variety of programs and administration which arise under this act than is any bureaucracy in Washington, be it in the OEO or elsewhere, or even at the State level. Therefore, our effort has been not to earmark programs but to leave a wide variety of decision to the community action agencies at the local level, having, in the end, implicit confidence in the successful workings of American democracy. If you cannot make these programs work at the local level, no bureaucrat is going to be able to make them work by issuing orders from Washington.

However, as the planning and coordinating role of the community action agency is strengthened, it will be necessary to assure that the agency is broadly representative of the community and does not represent a narrow segment—section 213.

Furthermore, it should be encouraged to use delegate agencies which would actually operate many of the programs—section 215. This role as prime sponsor would apply both to programs locally designed—section 220—and national emphasis programs, such as Headstart and legal service—section 221.

I should, perhaps, explain that these various programs are, roughly speaking, broken into two categories of what are called national emphasis programs, where OEO has indicated certain programs such as Headstart or the Neighborhood Youth Corps should be instituted, or communities where the program is being carried into effect. As I

shall explain at greater length later, 50 percent of the funds are set aside for national emphasis programs. The other 50 percent of the funds are to be utilized in such a way as the local community action agency may determine.

The role as prime sponsor would apply to both programs locally designed—section 220—and national emphasis programs, such as Headstart and legal services—section 221.

However, the Director would have certain options to fund statewide or regional agencies to operate programs where community action agencies do not exist, as they do not in many rural areas of this country—section 212—or to fund independent agencies directly if it would better serve the purposes of the act—section 220(c). That would be in rare instances where a local community action agency has gotten out of hand and is no longer a reputable group.

The committee bill would extend the concept of prime sponsor to the work and training programs of part B of title I. This part B is a pulling together of most of the local programs, such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps and other programs which operate at the local level and deal with manpower and employment.

Generally the prime sponsor would be the community action agency unless the Director determines that an alternative agency is likely to have greater capability—section 12(b). As with the community action program, the work and training prime sponsor would be required to adopt a systematic approach—section 123(d)—and would be encouraged to use delegate agencies—section 122(d). Here, too, the Director would have the option of using State agencies—section 129—or other independent agencies—section 123(c)—under certain circumstances.

This brings me to the fifth general conclusion reached by the committee. As desirable as these new programs are, the United States has not yet committed sufficient resources nor developed all the programs needed to eliminate poverty in the foreseeable future. During the second phase of the study the subcommittee intends to study what else is needed to do the total job. Meanwhile, the committee is recommending the adoption of the Emergency Employment Act in order to make an immediate impact upon the lack of job opportunity in areas of severe concentrations of poverty and unemployment.

During the course of our hearings, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] pressed Mr. Shriver pretty hard with respect to his plans for eliminating poverty in the United States in the next 10 years, as he had expressed himself as being able to do, if he got sufficient support from the President and Congress.

Mr. Shriver, as I indicated, was reluctant to respond to the questioning of the Senator from Rhode Island. Senator PELL said to him:

Mr. Shriver, if the poverty program continues to be funded at the rate recommended by the President in his budget message this year, how long will it be before the war is won?

Mr. Shriver squirmed in his seat, like a loyal representative of the President, ducking as best he could. He looked us in the eye, and said, "Never."

That is the problem which confronts us in a world beset by war, with a military budget running in excess of \$70 billion, and a \$2.3 billion military construction bill, which only at the last moment was saved from being adopted by a voice vote with only three Senators in the Chamber.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to inform the Senator from Pennsylvania that that is not quite the case. I did not know at that time what the majority leader's intention was. I later learned, upon his return to the floor, that it was his plan to go over until 3 p.m. on Monday. He did not arrive at that decision on the basis of any discussions that have lately transpired.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from West Virginia, the acting majority leader. I have been heartened by this information which restores some of my confidence, for the Senate faces up to its responsibility by having a rollcall vote when the amounts involved run over \$2 billion. I thank my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the war on poverty—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. What is the definition of poverty?

Mr. CLARK. Poverty is defined as a level of income which, for a family of four, a wife, husband, and two children, does not exceed \$3,000 a year. There would be a good deal of variation in that amount, depending, for example, on whether the family lived in the mountains of West Virginia or in Philadelphia, Pa. As the family increases, there would have to be modification.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Of course, there are mountains in Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. There are, indeed, beautiful mountains as those in West Virginia.

However, that is a rough and ready rule of thumb. The Senator from New York thinks that is too low an income level and it probably is for New York. I am sure that many persons in the South and in the Mountain States think that is too high. It has to be varied and flexible, but that is the rule of thumb.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. How would the Senator equate a \$3,000 annual income today with, let us say, 1932?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has me at a little bit of a disadvantage. I am trying to think through how much a 1932 dollar is worth today. My recollection is that it is about 25 cents, is it not?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. A \$3,000 income today could, therefore, be equated with, let us say, \$750 in annual income in 1932?

Mr. CLARK. Somewhere in that range. Of course, we have to remember not only the cost of living but I suppose, to a certain extent, some of the amenities of decent living today which were not even in existence then. I do not know if it is

appropriate for a family living in poverty to have a television set. I am inclined to doubt it; they all do. I do not know whether they are entitled to have an old jalopy to take the children to school. I do not think that in 1932 they thought so, but they do today. So much of this developed without any plan that I find it difficult to apply the same standards to poverty today as one would have applied in the depths of the depression in 1932.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will yield further while I have interrupted him, would it not be better if the Headstart program were under the auspices of local school boards?

Mr. CLARK. I have to give the Senator a complicated answer to that question. I think in many, many school districts the answer would be clearly "Yes." But I have seen school districts where I would not turn it over to the local school board for all the tea in China.

This is largely a racial problem. It also has something to do with the competency of teachers. I do not want to be invidious and name States and locations, but the best answer I can give to the Senator is that, in my opinion, authority to delegate the local school boards should be always there in the director of the OEO, and he should be encouraged so to delegate unless, in his opinion—and I have seen some places where in my opinion this would happen—it would at least wreck the program by doing it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Is the authority to operate the Headstart program vested within the local school boards in any jurisdictions throughout the country?

Mr. CLARK. No. The Director of OEO is given the authority with power to delegate. I should point out also to my friend that the Headstart program is not primarily an educational program. It is a child development program, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks, which includes in addition to an educational component, medical and dental services, nutritional and social services, and probably most important of all, parental involvement.

I have been to a score of these Headstart classes and have been extremely heartened by them. It would be difficult to convince oneself that the activities going on there are educational in anything other than the very broadest sense of the word. For example, many of the children are being taught the difference between their left and right hands. They are being taught things our parents taught us early in our lives.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Even so, would not these things be more within the capacity and capability of local schools than community action groups?

Mr. CLARK. If they want to, but there are so many cases and so many places where they do not. The Senator from West Virginia is an expert on the District of Columbia. I am not. I would hate to see a Headstart program turned over to the Board of Education in Washington, D.C., today.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I may disagree with the Senator on that.

Does the Director have the authority at the present time to delegate this responsibility to the local school boards?

Mr. CLARK. Oh, yes. He often does.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In what percent of the Headstart programs throughout the country has he so done?

Mr. CLARK. One-third of the full year, and two-thirds of summer programs are run by the public school systems. The Senator appreciates the difference in administrative difficulty between a summer program, when the school boards are generally more relaxed and have more time, than in all-year-round programs, in which—with so many different school districts—there is not any room and no teacher to take on the additional load of a Headstart program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have had, in general, good reports concerning the operation of the Headstart program. Most of the criticism I have heard has been to the effect that it should be operated by the school systems.

Mr. CLARK. This is the strong lobbying position of the National Education Association and the teacher unions. There is an enormous vested interest in this country trying to get the Headstart program away from the OEO and to have it placed in the school boards. I have great respect for the National Education Association. I have quite a lot of respect for the various teacher unions. But we must recognize it for what it is; namely, a lobbying effort.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. With regard to VISTA, does the Governor of a State presently have the privilege of vetoing the operations of VISTA?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, he does.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. How many of such vetoes have occurred?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know of any. I am speaking off the cuff here. I can get the information for the Senator by Monday next. Generally speaking, the VISTA program, I know, has been in trouble in West Virginia. But West Virginia is one of the very few places where there has been any trouble. We have been proud of VISTA in Pennsylvania.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There has been a great deal of trouble with VISTA in West Virginia. Can the Governor of West Virginia take action to preclude any further activities by VISTA in West Virginia?

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry, I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Even though VISTA has been operating in West Virginia, can the Governor, at some future date, veto further activities of VISTA?

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that he can.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Did the Senator's subcommittee hold any hearings in West Virginia?

Mr. CLARK. No. We intend to do so. What happened was that because of administrative problems, the Senator's colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH] who is on the subcommittee, and I, were unable to agree on a date when I could go with him to West Virginia. We set three different dates. Something came up each time. It certainly was not his fault. I

had other obligations. We fully intend to go there.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I know that the hearings had been announced and that the dates were changed from time to time. I did not know what the problems were. I wish that the subcommittee had conducted hearings in West Virginia.

Mr. CLARK. I can assure the Senator that we will.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I wish it had done so prior to the discussion on this bill because we have had problems with VISTA in West Virginia. I think it would have been good for the subcommittee, and for Congress, to know just precisely what the facts are regarding VISTA in West Virginia.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am sorry that the subcommittee did not conduct hearings in West Virginia. As I recall, I think I wrote to the distinguished chairman suggesting that hearings be conducted in Beckley, which is the county seat of my home county. Also, I believe, in Williamson in Mingo County.

Mr. CLARK. The reason we did not accept the invitation was that the Senator's colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH] had already selected Charleston and Princeton in West Virginia. I certainly do not want to pass the buck to the Senator's colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH], who is not here to defend himself. But I took it from him. I wanted to go where he wanted us to go.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Certainly, I am sure that my colleague needs no defense, but I say again, I wish that the subcommittee had held hearings in West Virginia prior to debate on the bill before us.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder whether the Senator is possibly confusing VISTA volunteers with the Appalachian volunteers, which are entirely different cases?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am not at all sure that I may not be. Yet, I do not think I am. I know about the latter cases also, and their difficulties which have arisen in the State of Kentucky. But, in any event, I am quite sure that VISTA people have created some problems in West Virginia.

Mr. CLARK. All I can say to my friend is that if the Governor does not like it, he can throw them out at any time, under the provisions of section 810(b) of the present act which reads in part:

Volunteers—

And this applies to VISTA—

shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I say to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that I hope the Governor of West Virginia will do just that.

Is the Senator from Pennsylvania aware of the fact that Gov. Hulett C. Smith wrote a letter to Mr. Shriver complaining recently about the activities of VISTA workers?

Mr. CLARK. I read about it in the newspapers.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Well, I suspected that the Governor could refuse

consent under the law. However, I cannot tell him what to do. I know what I would do if I were in his place.

Mr. CLARK. I cannot tell my Governor what to do, either. He is a Republican.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I intend, almost immediately, to terminate my remarks for the day. First, however, I should like to note a number of impressive accomplishments which the war on poverty has achieved.

First, 1,300,000 children have participated in Headstart and have received its educational, medical, and nutritional benefits.

Second, nearly 70,000 men and women have graduated from Job Corps centers. Seventy percent of them have moved directly from graduation into jobs, many of them for the first time in their lives. A good many others, I might note, went into the military service.

Third, at least 300,000 poor people have received advice and services provided by the legal services program.

Fourth, more than 7,000 VISTA volunteers have served or are currently serving at least a year in rural poverty areas, urban slums, or Indian reservations, or with the migrant poor.

Fifth, 30,000 poor but talented high school students have participated in the Upward Bound program to equip them for the opportunity to attend a college.

Sixth, more than 900,000 boys and girls from 16 to 21 have received full time or part time work-experience in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Seventh, more than 42,000 Americans have received rural loans for farm improvements and small income-producing enterprises.

These are only a few of the many specific achievements of the war on poverty. They speak of specific and measurable gains. There are, of course, other gains very difficult, if not impossible, to measure, I shall deal with them in the course of the debate.

Mr. President, I think that is a good place to stop for today. I have attempted to lay down the general philosophy of the bill, the work done by the subcommittee in bringing it before us, the five major conclusions which the committee came to. I have discussed in some depth the problem of coordination.

Frankly I am not too sure whether it would be wise to go into an extended explanation of these programs before permitting general debate and consideration of amendments, but I would like to do two things: first, to outline the various programs which are dealt with in the act; and, second, to give some indication of the floor issues which will come up in the debate next week as indicated by the minority and individual views.

There will be much discussion of the Job Corps. That is title IV of the report, and title I-A of the bill.

We have consolidated into title I-B all of the work and training programs. That is title V of the report.

We have put the special impact program, which is the brainchild of Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS of New York, into title I-D of the bill. It is title VI of the report.

Title II of the bill—title VII of the report—contains the community action program.

The rural loan program is title III(a) of the bill and title VIII of the report.

The migrant program is title III(b) of the bill, and title IX of the report.

The small business part of the bill is title IV of the act and title X of the report.

The day care part of the bill is title V(B) of the act and title XI of the report.

The public assistance and training income section is title XII of the report.

VISTA is title XIII of the report.

The emergency employment program is title XIV of the report.

With respect to each of these titles in the report, which I strongly commend to Senators who are interested in acquiring a mastery of this complex bill, each of the titles is divided into a finding which, generally speaking, describes the program and what the committee thinks about it, and then the legislative recommendation.

I would not expect Senators to wade every bit of the way through this entire report, but nevertheless a reading of the full report will provide a far better picture than I can in a floor speech reported in the RECORD of the various complex issues with which we will be confronted.

I would like, however, to summarize, in conclusion today, the floor issues which, in my judgment, will come before the Senate in a rather extensive debate.

The first one has to do with the spin-off or transfer of programs from OEO to other agencies. There might be an effort to transfer the Job Corps—an effort made unsuccessfully last year.

There is the possibility of an effort to transfer Headstart to the Office of Education, Follow Through to the Office of Education, and Upward Bound to the Office of Education.

In each case the committee considered the suggestions and rejected them.

That would be the position of the floor manager of the bill.

The second category of issues would have to do with funding. In this connection, the bill provides a 2-year authorization but does not state a figure for the second year, slightly increases the administration's recommended budget for the antipoverty programs and contains a separate 2-year, \$2.8 billion Emergency Employment Act.

I will be prepared to justify the position of the committee in these regards, and I feel the committee's position is unquestionably justified.

There may be an effort to earmark funds for Headstart instead of permitting the local community action agencies to have far greater flexibility as to how they desire to spend the funds at the local level. It is the view of the committee that this effort to earmark puts the strong Federal hand into the administration of programs at the local level. This is an

unwise move. We think greater local flexibility is highly desirable. To sit here and tell Charleston, W. Va., Newark, N.J., Springfield, Mass., or anywhere else how much they should spend for each one of these programs is unwise.

A highly controversial area, which I mentioned earlier, has to do with the Governor's veto. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and I have already had a discussion on that point, but it applies to areas far wider than VISTA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again at this point?

Mr. CLARK. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think the Director of OEO indicated, in response to the Governor's letter, that a number of VISTA workers were being withdrawn. However, I am not sure that they would not have been withdrawn anyhow, because summer had ended. Moreover, I would not want to leave the impression that it is my intention to cast any reflection on all VISTA personnel. Undoubtedly some of them may have had good intentions. But so far as the proof of the pudding in West Virginia is concerned, I think our people have been quite disturbed and dissatisfied with the operation of the VISTA program there.

I have a good impression of the Neighborhood Youth Corps as it has been operated in my State. I think the people of West Virginia have been favorably impressed with this program and with some of the community action programs.

Although the subcommittee has not been able to go to my State to hold hearings, which I think would have been highly beneficial at this point, I hope that it still will go. I hope it will conduct hearings in the communities to which I have referred, as well as in any other communities where the subcommittee may wish to hold hearings. But I would hope to speak with the distinguished chairman and suggest to him certain communities and certain persons within those communities.

Mr. CLARK. I should be happy to discuss that with the Senator. I feel certain that he would agree that the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] should be brought in on these discussions, since he is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Absolutely.

Mr. CLARK. Some other issues may be raised concerning the Job Corps. There may also be other issues concerning the community action program, which is not uncontroversial. I have no doubt that a discussion of these problems will take a good deal of time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As witness Washington, D.C.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. The subcommittee had 2 days of hearings on the community action program right here in the District of Columbia. I must say to the Senator that we also had a special staff assistant make a study, in some depth, of the workings of this program. Say what one will, in my opinion it was working pretty well.

Mr. President, I think I have said enough for today to outline the general course the debate will take. It may be

necessary for me, on Monday, to return to this subject in order to make a more detailed statement in some depth, and I reserve that right.

Mr. President, for the time being, I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the AFL-CIO Executive Council, in its recent session in New York, urged Congress and the American people to support the bill amending the Economic Opportunity Act as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The council also commented on the war on poverty legislation now before the House.

Since the arguments made by the AFL-CIO are well worthy of our consideration, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON ANTIPOVERTY LEGISLATION, NEW YORK, N.Y., SEPTEMBER, 12, 1967

We must bring the millions living under conditions of privation and poverty into the mainstream of our national life.

The war on poverty being carried on under the Office of Economic Opportunity is an important step in this direction. It was intended and to a large degree has been successful in involving the poor in such community action programs as Head Start, neighborhood health centers, legal services, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and a host of other programs.

The war on poverty under the OEO is not the whole answer to the problem of the ghetto, but it is a good beginning. As such, it deserves the continued support of the American people and of the Congress; it deserves more adequate funding so that it can expand its various programs; it deserves to be retained as an entity as the central anti-poverty agency of the Federal government.

Earlier this year the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the leadership of Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, made an extensive survey of OEO's anti-poverty programs. The results of this study have largely been incorporated into the bill amending the Economic Opportunity Act and reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The legislation now before the Senate deserves the support of Congress and the American people. The AFL-CIO Executive Council endorses it and urges that it be adopted without amendment.

The present bill closely follows the original Act in concept and language. However, it does make some changes which may be regarded as strengthening the existing program. The bill provides for the continuation of the 90 percent Federal—10 percent local funding ratio; it provides for a two-year authorization period instead of the current one-year period; it continues the local community action agencies as the spearhead of the local war on poverty and permits greater flexibility in their organization and operation; and it provides for continuation of the Job Corps, the In-and-Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Nelson Amendment (Operation Mainstream), the Scheuer Amendment (New Careers) and the Concentrated Employment Program.

An important innovation in this bill is a new Emergency Employment Act of 1967, which provides for a major employment program. The program would provide jobs in both the public and private sectors for the unemployed and disadvantaged in the slum areas in such fields as health, public safety, education, welfare recreation and also in municipal and neighborhood improvement,

maintenance, reconstruction and beautification projects. The program is intended to provide meaningful jobs and socially-productive employment.

The bill calls for the expenditure of one billion dollars in the current fiscal year for the creation of an estimated 200,000 jobs.

The AFL-CIO called for a massive job creation program in its testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty last March. While we believe that at least one million jobs are needed annually, the Emergency Employment Act as part of the omnibus OEO bill, is an important first step. We strongly urge the Senate to approve it.

The House Education and Labor Committee is scheduled to begin marking up the anti-poverty bill this week.

One proposal before the Committee would provide a direct 25% wage subsidy to private, profit-making companies employing unskilled youth. The AFL-CIO strongly opposes such a wage subsidy as an ill-advised incentive for short-term, substandard jobs when the emphasis should properly be placed on the training necessary for permanent employment of young people as gainful members of the work force.

The war on poverty cannot be regarded as a partisan effort. It is and, in fact, should be above partisan politics. It is a war from which there must be no retreat and the AFL-CIO intends to push steadfastly on to victory over poverty.

AUSTIN LIONS CLUB RECEIVES PERSUASIVE ADDRESS ON WAR ON POVERTY FROM SOUTHWEST REGIONAL DIRECTOR WALTER RICHTER

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on August 24, 1967, Mr. Walter Richter, director of the Southwest Regional Office of Economic Opportunity addressed the Austin, Tex., Lions Club on the questions which have recently arisen across the country about the effective operation of the war on poverty. This intelligent and encouraging speech will be, I am sure, a landmark in the progress of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its work in Texas. A clear and forthright statement of the needs of our country which this program meets, the speech presents clearly all the aspects of the war on poverty and its appeal for all the different political persuasions of this country.

Mr. Richter concludes that the war on poverty is liberal and conservative, and Christian, and that "it would be a great tragedy for all of America if it is not continued." He further notes:

I want the world to know that I am proud to be identified with a program that has a deep commitment to fight ignorance, intolerance, injustice, and—I believe worst of all—indifference.

I commend Mr. Richter on this outstanding presentation of the actual workings and purpose of OEO, and on his thoughtful service as director of their Southwest Regional Office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that "Should the War on Poverty Be Continued?" a speech by Walter Richter, of Texas, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE WAR ON POVERTY BE CONTINUED?

(Address before the Lions Club of Austin, Tex., by Walter Richter, director, Southwest Region Office of Economic Opportunity, August 24, 1967)

The grapevine has it that there is a possibility that this Congress will kill the poverty program or at least substantially mutilate it. A few months ago, prior to the spate of riots in a couple dozen of our major cities, the picture looked different. Volumes of testimony had been produced in Senate and House subcommittee hearings, most of it positive, including endorsements from almost every organization you can mention from the American Bar Association to the AFL-CIO. On the sidelines, no less a personage than the Reverend Billy Graham provided a resounding endorsement of the anti-poverty campaign. So did governors, mayors, social workers, housewives, butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers.

There was also dissent, of course, but the tide was definitely moving in favor of continuation of the OEO and the program. All of this was bolstered by a recent Harris poll which concluded that 60% of the American people wanted the poverty program continued at the present level or enlarged.

Then came the riots and reaction. Now the legislation is in trouble.

I should like to take this opportunity to share with you my personal assessment of this state of affairs and the implication for this community and, in fact, for America.

First, I should like to review some of the considerations which properly were a part of the judgments that led to the formal declaration of war on poverty by President Johnson and the subsequent enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Questions that were properly and logically asked included these: "Is poverty real in America? If so, is it really damaging our society? Are the poor salvageable and worth worrying with? If so, how do we go about it? Is this a proper concern of the federal government?"

Time does not permit me to elaborate at length on these questions but, briefly stated, these were and are the conclusions:

Is poverty real in America? The answer is definitely yes. Using the arbitrary poverty-level measure of a \$3,000 annual 4-member family income, it was estimated that the United States had some 34 million such people in 1964. (A recent estimate indicates that this has now been reduced to something less than 30 million.)

Whatever the measuring device we use, the fact is inescapable that America has far too many citizens who are receiving insufficient and inadequate diets, medical and dental attention, housing, and other commonplace benefits of this affluent society. Few evidences of poverty are visible from main street or along the paths we normally travel in our daily routines, but they are there and can be shown to any doubter willing to seek them out.

Well then, the next question is—is poverty really damaging and costly to our society? The answer is again clearly yes. America spent some \$30 billion on crime last year—and only the naive would deny that a great deal of criminal activity relates to slum environments and poverty. Disease breeds in the slum areas far out of proportion to other parts of a city, and its overall cost defies measure but is obviously enormous. Welfare costs, which the War on Poverty seeks to reduce, are a direct price we pay for poverty.

Our society suffers in many ways from the loss of productivity by the legions of unemployed and underemployed who cannot qualify for decent jobs which are available but which require special training and skills. It is interesting to note that the businessman with a cash register business has the

most to lose from poverty in dollars and cents. For every \$100 per year increase in the income of the poor in America (and you can depend on their spending every penny), our economy would be fattened by \$3 billion—which, my economist friends who know about multiplier formulas tell me, would turn over five times.

There is, of course, the most important price—which is human misery and unhappiness, a cancer in any society. In these are rooted the breeding grounds for hatred and discontent which find expression in all types of overt, devious, and dangerous manifestations, including physical violence.

So we concede that poverty is costly, very costly, in many ways. The next logical question is: can the poor be helped or are they intrinsically worthless. A Gallup poll in 1965 indicated that 55% of all Americans believe that the poor are poor because they are lazy, and I honestly believe that this attitude on the part of large numbers of our people has been in large measure responsible for the difficulty we have experienced in obtaining public support for the anti-poverty program. Certainly they have been quick to accept and even applaud any and every indication of failure.

Let us examine briefly the validity of this generalization about the poor as an excuse to accept poverty as a way of life for countless numbers of our people and as a necessary evil in our society.

About 40% of the poor are children. They can hardly be written off as undeserving of our sympathetic attention. In fact, now while their work habits and attitudes are being formed is obviously the best time to try to achieve positive response to direction and training.

About one-third are the elderly who, whatever their past work experience, have their productivity pretty much behind them. Many of them have worked hard all their lives but now have to cope with reduced physical capabilities, increased vulnerability to disease, and an employment rationale which cruelly penalizes workers on the basis of age, starting as early as age 45.

Countless numbers are widows and divorcees with children, with debts, and without sufficient skills to earn a decent wage.

Roughly half of the adults among the poor are not unemployed at all—witness, for example the tens of thousands of migrants who live in the Texas Valley. They can hardly be accused of being lazy—and yet they are in poverty because of illiteracy and lack of occupational skills.

Even the assumption of the worthlessness of people on welfare which most of us indulge in can be effectively challenged. A recent survey of the 7.3 million Americans who are on welfare revealed that only 50,000 males have anything like the capability of getting off the rolls through job training that could make them self-sufficient.

Who then is on welfare? 2.1 million are 65 or older, average age 72; 700,000 are either blind or severely handicapped; 3.5 million are children whose parents cannot support them; the remaining one million are the parents of these children: about 900,000 mothers and 150,000 fathers. Two thirds of the 150,000 fathers on welfare are incapacitated, leaving 50,000 capable of receiving training. The OEO, incidentally, has a program specifically designed to provide training to such as these, and it has been very successful.

What I'm saying is that any American who assumes his poverty-stricken brother is deserving of his fate and could improve his lot if he only had the gumption is making a dangerous generalization from too small a sample of truly worthless indigents. These creatures do exist, and since lack of motivation is a symptom of poverty I'm not sure

that we should give up on them. For the time being, however, I would be willing to yield to a critical public and concentrate on the hundreds of thousands of deprived Americans who earnestly and sincerely welcome a chance to help themselves. Maybe we can get to the others later.

I hope at this point you agree with me that poverty in America is real, that it is costly to our society, and that to assume that poor people are beyond salvage is to beg our responsibility. If so, then we are now at the point that Congress was when it passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which presumed to suggest that Americans were strong enough, rich enough, resourceful enough, and wise enough to make a manly effort to eradicate poverty from the environs of this great country.

In his inaugural address, President Johnson declared, "In a land of wealth, families must not live in hopeless poverty. In a land rich in harvest, children must not go hungry. In a land of healing miracles, neighbors must not suffer and die unattended."

In the Economic Opportunity Act, Congress made a historic declaration of national policy. Upon the recommendation of the President, Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States "to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this Nation."

Pursuant to this national policy commitment, the fundamental goals of the OEO are simple but most important in terms of national objectives. As defined in the Economic Opportunity Act itself, those goals are to open up to every individual in this nation: the opportunity for education and training; the opportunity to work; and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

This noble statement of mission—with the accent on opportunity—is certainly in the American tradition and can hardly be decried. There are those, of course, who question the involvement of the federal government in this undertaking. I can only respond that the stakes for our society are sufficiently high that we can defend federal participation on the same basis as we support our defense establishment, interstate roads, and the postal service. Moreover, the primary thrust of the anti-poverty legislation is to support and encourage local communities in establishing, expanding, and properly utilizing local (and other) resources through the use of local initiative and local community action.

Other interesting new dimensions of the anti-poverty campaign rationale include a dedication to the concept of removing the causes of poverty rather than treating the symptoms; the establishment of a broad-based independent but responsible local administrative body widely representative of all elements and segments of a given community; and the "maximum feasible" participation of the poor themselves.

Emphasis has been on communication—especially on the development of important dialogues, between the poor and the representatives of the so-called power system and between the agencies, public and private, which have resources designed to serve the needs of the poor.

There has ensued a great ferment of ideas, and one might even say with some authority that among the War on Poverty's most significant accomplishments are side effects on established educational, training, and people-serving institutions.

The next part of my comments I shall omit because of lack of time. This would be a recitation of specific impressive accomplishments of the War on Poverty effort—despite many difficulties which you might correctly assume would be encountered in such a massive, complex and exceedingly difficult undertaking. The record is there and I believe any objective observer examining it will find it over-all indeed quite impressive.

I want to share with you briefly my concern about the anti anti-poverty campaign sentiment of today—a public attitude which seems to me to border on hysteria. I see the nobility of the mission being obscured by side issues and allegations which are either not germane or of little actual consequence.

Let me cite a few examples.

An OEO employee makes a questionable judgment about the purchase of some gun sights. One single employee—a respected man in the community. The incident made headlines—some of the banner variety—across the country and has triggered a congressional investigation, no less. The entire poverty program is discredited.

OEO establishes a summer work program to ease tensions. Some OEO officials have the notion that the program might reach and rehabilitate some of the chronic trouble makers by employing a few youths with minor police records. More headlines. Reaction: let's kill OEO.

OEO funds a program in which one of the educational components is aborted by a staff person to teach very young pupils what might correctly be termed as "hate" materials. The scheme was discovered before any funds were expended. More headlines. OEO is an evil thing.

A community submits an application for the establishment of a newspaper to be delivered to the poor free of charge. OEO has received many such applications and has rejected them all. But the newspapers receive and reprint from coast to coast a story that OEO is putting the government into competition with the privately-owned journals. Headlines. Not many retractions. Damn OEO!

Thirteen OEO employees are among more than 12,000 people arrested in 27 cities experiencing riots this summer. While the record of OEO efforts to help prevent or cool down potential tension-filled situations is a thing of joy, the headlines stress OEO involvement in the riots, OEO gotta go, go, go.

If you wish to play this game further, search your memory for the negative things you have heard or read about the War on Poverty. Job Corps boys in trouble (they get in less trouble than all youth that age); the mayor's son shows up on the Neighborhood Youth Corps (it happened in the beginning before better controls were established but the stories go on and on).

Then there are such as these:

A mother of a poverty kid in a summer camp complaining because the food isn't good enough.

A Community Action program personnel committee hiring a guy for political reasons when obviously there are better qualified candidates.

A minority group being discriminated against in the staffing of a neighborhood center.

I could go on and on. And you, I'm sure, could contribute a few choice items yourself.

The significant point I want to make is that it is my judgment that 99% of the disenchantment with the OEO stems from deficiencies not of the program but of individual humans—usually in the form of personal transgression, immorality, or ineptness at the local level.

One of OEO's strengths—its dedication to local control and local initiative—becomes a serious weakness and could be its undoing. Already the local autonomy has been eroded by the earmarking process and by other forced priority judgments for local projects.

This is not to suggest for an instant that this operation has been free of mistakes at all levels. It hasn't. I can tell you, however, that we're working hard at building quality into every phase of the program and tremendous progress has been made operationally. Seems I recall a part of an old gentleman's prayer in which he observed: "I ain't what I ought to be. I ain't what I want to be. I ain't what I'm gonna be. But

thank God, I ain't what I wuz!" That's OEO!

My plea to Congress, to use an earthy expression, is simply this: please don't burn down the house to kill the cockroaches. The poverty program is too right, too necessary, and the stakes too high to scuttle it for reasons which in the final analysis are superficial.

To eliminate the OEO on the basis of the type of criticisms and charges floating around this summer would be like abolishing banking because a teller got off with some cash or closing our public schools because a teacher was discovered at a pot party. It's almost like denying Christianity because a preacher takes a shine to the organist.

OEO in my book is Christianity in practice because it decries evil and supports the innate nobility of the individual person. OEO is liberal because it seeks change where, heaven knows, we need change. OEO is conservative because its operational emphasis is on self-help, on local initiative and on honest effort.

Should the War on Poverty be continued? I am convinced it would be a great tragedy for all of America if it is not continued. Can we afford it financially? The OEO costs per year about what the war in Vietnam costs in a month. And unlike in that war, this expenditure has all the earmarks of money invested with a guaranteed return.

In closing, I want to testify that I have never been so excited or so challenged by an assignment.

I want the world to know that I am proud to be identified with a program that has a deep commitment to fight ignorance, intolerance, injustice, and—I believe worst of all—indifference. You know Dante wrote that "the hottest places in Hell are reserved for those who in a period of moral crisis maintain their neutrality." You better believe that we're in a period of moral crisis in this country right now. And if too many of us respond by maintaining a posture of neutrality and indifference, we may not only go to Hell—we may go a bit sooner than we expected.

VIETNAM

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, yesterday before the General Assembly of the United Nations our distinguished Ambassador, the Honorable Arthur Goldberg, asked the Hanoi government for assurance that if our Government would cease bombing in the north, the Hanoi government would begin negotiations for peace in Vietnam.

The Ambassador suggested two possible means by which talks could be initiated. The Geneva Conference could be convened, or there could be private talks leading to a political settlement in Vietnam. He further said that once peace had been achieved, the United States would undertake a major commitment to the development of all of Southeast Asia.

I applaud this conciliatory address by the Ambassador to the United Nations. I think that it represents a forward step on the part of our Government toward bringing about peace in Vietnam, and I am very hopeful that the Hanoi government will accede to the request, and affirm its willingness to negotiate upon cessation of bombing of the north.

Mr. President, also yesterday the President of the United States was asked whether our commitment in Vietnam was worth the loss in lives and materiel that we have endured there. In essence, the President said that in his opinion it was.

I would support his assessment. This certainly is no time for second guessing as to whether our commitment is worthy. Questions of this sort are no consolidation to the more than 100,000 casualties that we have suffered there, nor to the mothers and widows of our more than 13,000 servicemen whose lives have been lost in Vietnam, nor to the American people, who have spent billions and billions of dollars in that far-off Southeast Asian land.

Our Government has steadfastly said that we are in Vietnam for the purpose of giving the South Vietnamese people an opportunity to choose their form of government in freedom and in security. We are also there because we wish to prevent the spread of Communist regimes by force and by terror.

I think it cannot be questioned that both of those objectives are worthy. The more than 13,000 men who have lost their lives in Vietnam have not died in vain, nor have the 100,000 other casualties been injured in vain. We have prevented the spread of an unpopular regime by force and by terror.

But the other purpose for being in Vietnam—namely, that of permitting the Vietnamese people to choose their own form of government—is of extreme importance to us today and even though I am very hopeful that the Hanoi government will give us an assurance, so that negotiations for peace can begin, nevertheless, we cannot count on them to do so. We are still at war, and we must take those steps, militarily, and politically, which will begin to move us toward an honorable and final conclusion.

I suggest, Mr. President, that the political purpose for which we are in Vietnam to some degree has already been realized. The elections in Vietnam are history. A government has been chosen by the people of Vietnam. There have been criticisms of that election—some of them very valid criticisms. But there have been valid criticisms of some of our elections here in the United States of America. We cannot expect a nation of people who have never had the opportunity to choose their own form of government, who have had little or no exposure to real democracy, to carry on a perfect election. I, too, have been critical of many of the things that have taken place in regard to the Vietnam elections. I deplore the fact that there has been censorship of the press in Vietnam by the government, and that the candidates were not always permitted to campaign according to the rules that had been adopted. I deplore the fact that the military ticket itself frequently violated the established rules of procedure. And am greatly disturbed at the fact that the government has seen fit to arrest a number of its political opponents since the elections.

Yet, Mr. President, the election has been described by persons who were on the scene as being as fair and as impartial an election as could be expected under the circumstances. Some have gone so far as to say that it was as fair as any election held in the United States of America. Though I do not believe that, at least there is evidence that the

election, to a large degree, was fairly and freely conducted. A variety of opinions were aired, some surprising results were achieved. And it can safely be said that South Vietnam will never be quite the same again.

Eighty-three percent of the people voted, which is important and extremely significant. And, though the present government received only 34.8 percent of the votes, nevertheless it does reflect the first time that the people of Vietnam have had a say in the choice of a national government.

We could have hoped for better. We could have hoped that there would have been a civilian government elected, persons who were not identified with the military junta. We could perhaps have hoped that there would have been wider representation of other groups. Of the six tickets that were elected, three of them were Catholic. It is unfortunate that this occurred in a country where the great majority of the people, 90 percent, are Buddhists.

These things can be corrected, however. The government can appoint Buddhists to administrative office, especially cabinet positions, in the new government.

There is still an election to be held, on October 22, for the lower house. And the wrongs that were perpetrated in the Senate election can be righted. We must not ignore the importance of the election to be held on October 22. They must not be open to criticism.

I am hopeful that censorship of the press, which was removed for a time, and now seems to have been reimposed, will be lifted permanently. Freedom of the press indeed any freedom, cannot be intermittent. It must be constant and continuous.

I am hopeful that the procedure of arresting political opponents will also stop and that this government will instead begin to invite these former opponents to form a truly national, coalition government.

A plurality government such as we now have in South Vietnam is not unusual. We have had plurality Presidents in the United States of America. After World War II, the French and German governments were plurality governments, and they did well.

It is now up to the South Vietnamese Government to begin to form this coalition, and to unite the people of South Vietnam behind its purposes.

Mr. President, much must be done by this government. They are constantly getting advice from us, and I think it is important that Members of the U.S. Senate continually let the South Vietnamese Government know what we think, because we do have a very grave commitment in South Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese Government has promised land reform. And if they are to ever win over the peasants in Vietnam, or win the war, they must get on with land reform.

However, the thing that disturbs me most is that it still appears that the South Vietnamese Government and its people have not made a total commitment to this war.

Mr. President, this is not our war. Vietnam is not our country. We are sending Americans to die there, and they are dying and being injured there daily.

I think that certainly the South Vietnamese should begin to assume more responsibility for this war.

The government has now been elected. It would seem to me that they should begin to increase their areas of responsibility both in the field of combat and in economic and political matters. And as they begin to increase their responsibility, it would seem to me that we could begin to decrease our responsibility and our commitment of manpower and materiel to South Vietnam.

I think that the South Vietnamese Government should forthwith institute an effective program for military conscription. They are still only taking men who are 20 years of age. Let us compare this with North Vietnam.

In North Vietnam, every able-bodied man is fighting in the armed forces. In North Vietnam young women are performing military duty. In North Vietnam, older men and women are carrying 600 pounds of supplies on bicycles and doing all that they can to assist their government in its efforts.

Surely the South Vietnamese people have as great a stake in the future of their country. It would seem to me that they too should make an all-out commitment, and that they should begin to take on more and more of this responsibility. It is their war, and it must always be considered their war.

Mr. President, I do not believe that our Government should send one more soldier or one more marine to fight and to die in Vietnam until the South Vietnamese Government begins to stand up to its responsibility and utilize its manpower to successfully conclude that war.

I know that they will have problems. I know that they have been plagued with corruption in the military. I know that their officers have not had the best training and that their salaries are very low. And I do not want anything I say here tonight to be construed as not living up to our commitment in Vietnam.

I do not believe that our job is finished. And I do not believe that we should get out of Vietnam until we finish our job.

I am merely saying that the responsibility of the South Vietnamese should be increasing constantly so that our responsibility can decrease constantly.

I am very hopeful that our Government will do more to urge the Vietnamese Government to move in this direction. I think it can be done. I think that it should be done.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKE. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has been making a very great contribution. His general thesis is one which I myself have felt for a long time was very close to the truth concerning Vietnam.

As he did, I, too, visited Vietnam earlier this year, in May. I came back convinced that the commitment we had

c

27

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Sept. 26, 1967
For actions of Sept. 25, 1967
90th-1st; No. 151

CONTENTS

CCC.....1,22	Foreign trade...13,28,32,36	Poverty.....2,25
Claims.....23	Forestry laboratory.....7	Recreation.....8
Commodity exchanges.....35	4-H Clubs.....20	River basin.....38
Congressional reform.....16	Grain reserves.....3	Rural jobs.....37
Consumer affairs.....21,27	Holiday.....29	Rural poverty.....2
Cotton.....33	Job Corps.....18	Small business.....10
Economy.....5	Legislation resume.....26	Spending.....4,17
Employment.....37	Loans.....10,22	St. Lawrence Seaway.....12
Expenditures.....4,17	Meat inspection.....9	Taxation.....5,11,30
Experts and consultants..6	Military construction....1	Textiles.....13,36
Farm Bureau.....19	Milk imports.....28	Transportation.....12
Food additives.....31	Opinion poll.....14	Water pollution.....15
Food controls.....24	Organization.....34	
Foreign aid.....39	Personnel.....6	

SENATE

1. **MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.** Passed, 74-3, with amendments H. R. 11722, the military construction authorization bill. Conferees were appointed. House conferees have not been appointed. This bill includes authorization of appropriations for payment on the debt to CCC for foreign currencies used in prior years by the Defense Dept. for foreign military family housing. pp. S13560, 13565-9

2. **POVERTY.** Continued debate on S. 2388, proposed Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967. pp. S13558-64, S13576-91

Sen. Mondale inserted a statement by the AFL-CIO which includes a program relating to rural poverty. pp. S13548-51

3. GRAIN. Sen. McCarthy urged the enactment of his bill S. 2233, to establish a grain reserve program, and inserted a speech by Secretary Freeman in support of this measure. pp. S13571-2
4. SPENDING. Sen. Proxmire continued his criticism of the benefit-cost ratio used in determining the economic feasibility of public works projects and inserted testimony on "Interest Rate Guidelines for Federal Decisionmaking." pp. S13543-5
5. ECONOMY; TAXATION. Sen. Proxmire disagreed with the proposed tax increase and urged a cut in federal spending. He inserted several articles in support of his position. pp. S13535-7, S13555
6. PERSONNEL. Sen. Williams, Del., criticized "unnecessary expansion by the various agencies of the number of experts and consultants employed on a per diem basis," and inserted a CSC report on the number of these employees during the period of July 1 through Dec. 31, 1966. pp. S13533-5
7. FORESTRY LABORATORY. Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserted his speech made at the dedication of the Forestry Science Laboratory, Morgantown, W. Va. pp. S13591-2
8. RECREATION. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee completed work on S. 1267, to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area, Idaho. p. D848

HOUSE

9. MEAT INSPECTION. H. R. 12144, as reported (see Digest 149), includes provisions as follows: Makes ante mortem inspection mandatory rather than permissive. Makes products "capable of use as human food" (rather than the present law's language "prepared for human consumption") subject to inspection. Requires foreign slaughtering and processing facilities to meet domestic standards. Permits the Department to take action if the States do not protect the public's meat supply. Permits Federal technical and planning assistance to the States. Authorizes grants to States for meeting standards established by the Department. Subject to court review, permits the Department after opportunity for hearing to deny inspection to any facility responsibly connected with any person convicted of certain violations of law. Authorizes seizure and detention of meat or meat products if there is reason to believe they are adulterated or misbranded or distributed in violation of the law. Authorizes warning letters for minor offenses and reduction of certain crimes from felony to misdemeanor in order to facilitate prosecution.
10. SMALL BUSINESS. Received the conference report on S. 1862, to increase the authorization for the SBA revolving fund and extend the maturity period for small business facilities loans (H. Rept. 660). pp. H12364-8
11. TAXATION. Rep. Multer inserted a speech by a money market "expert" outlining "the reasons why Congress should enact the President's 10-percent surcharge proposal." pp. H12419-22
12. TRANSPORTATION. Both Houses received from the President the annual report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. The President stated traffic

This is a time to remember who we are—our great heritage, of the people we are and must continue to be. The people who fathered Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Lincoln and Lee. The people who first united a continent with roads and railroads, produced the steamship, the telephone, the airplane and the greatest economy the world has ever known.

Yes, let us remember who we are. For a little pride is the wellspring of courage. Let us endure unflinchingly whatever sacrifices we are called upon to make to defend our free institutions from the night of communism, which is bent on undermining our faith in ourselves and our God.

Speaking of man and of what should be included in the declaration of independence, John Adams said, "let us hear the dignity of his nature and the noble rank he holds among the works of God." This was the impressive philosophy of the declaration. It held high the dignity of the individual man. With the adoption of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights defining the right of free men to govern themselves, the struggle for political freedom for the individual had made a monumental gain.

Although the environment in which we live, mental as well as physical, is in the process of changing more swiftly—and perhaps more threateningly—than ever before in mankind's history, there is little change in the realities of a man's inner life. The lessons man learns through human experience change little, if at all.

The concept of freedom, which the genius of the Athenians of 2500 years ago brought to the Western World, and which is so integral a part of our American outlook, still challenges the thoughts and consciences and actions of the men who are our leaders in every walk of life.

The inner man, that part of him which we recognize as his character, is developed in the frontrunners of business management and of politics—indeed, in every man whose ambition urges him to leadership—by intelligent and consciously directed discipline. It is all very well for Albert Einstein to remark, "How do I work? I grope."

But in order for that scientific genius to reach the point where he could recognize the truths his gropings uncovered, he must have trained his inner man stubbornly and searchingly.

Preoccupied, as we are today, with new discoveries, new products, new inventions of things, it is well to remember that long before man created objects that would do something—autos, guns, television sets, space craft—he created objects that were something—beautiful or meaningful or magical.

To reach the full maturity of the inner man, not only is intelligent training and self-discipline a necessity, but the aspiring leader must also assiduously cultivate the speculative spirit and the accommodation to uncertainty that are indispensable to any endeavor.

"All truth is safe," wrote Max Muller, "and nothing else is safe; and he who keeps back the truth, or withholds it from men, for motives of expediency, is either a coward or a criminal or both."

This is a hard lesson, as uncompromising as a policeman's club, but it is a lesson that the true leader must make an undeviating element of his character.

That wise man with the improbable name, Panayotis Pipinelis, has written, "If you are honest, it is the best thing in the world. It goes above intelligence." Certainly this is one character trait that exemplifies more than any other the inherent dignity of man. Just as the quality of being adaptable makes human beings the dominant race on this planet—for no other organism is so independent of environment—a man's rigid adherence to honesty toward himself and toward his fellow men distinguishes the one

person to whom other men may look, safely and confidently, for guidance.

In the hurly-burly of today, as almost unimaginable changes compress and intensify difficulties men have always been called upon to face, a sure and solid base is an explicit requirement if a man is to be able to realize even a part of Archimedes' boast, "Give me where to stand and I will move the earth."

AN OBSERVATION ABOUT OUR AMERICAN YOUTH

A very successful U.S. advertising agency got out a booklet called "a study of young people."

In the preface, the booklet forecasts "a new image of youth" and says, "whether we like it or not, the new image is coming and on the whole we should welcome it."

In the communications field we must learn to recognize it and work with it . . . (because) . . . the advertiser who adjusts first to the new trend will be the one who builds the strongest rapport with the youth of tomorrow.

The government official, the civic leader, the manufacturer of consumer goods, the advertising man, the teacher, the preacher, the rabbi who does not recognize the change soon enough to act on it may be left behind.

For a long time, we have become accustomed to a "delinquency image" of the younger generation. But today a great transition is in progress.

We are witnessing an almost complete reversal in many very basic values. The change is definitely coming. In some respects, it is already here.

We predict that soon one of the most powerful images in the world will be the image of the nobility of youth.

The components of the new image are nobility, virtue and romanticism. Tomorrow's image is a picture of high purpose—the higher the better.

This prediction is confirmed on many sides. Each day, it seems, I pick up a new bit of confirmation.

Today, my fellow Americans, we face a new world, a world of change, the thrust into outer-space with the satellites, spheres and missiles, marks a beginning of another epoch in the long story of mankind.

We are reaching out for a new boundless frontier.

We think and speak in strange terms—of harnessing the cosmic energy, of making winds and tides work for us.

Such dreams and fantasies as to make life the most exciting and challenging of all times.

The time is coming when studying the ocean, mining and farming its resources, living and working beneath its 139 million square miles will become commonplace—as familiar as all these activities are now on the one-third of the earth's surface which is not under water.

Oceans will become, along with aerospace, the two great new markets of the 21st century.

Exploration of the ocean depths has already revealed a world quite as strange and exciting as that of outer space—a world of mountain ranges taller than the Himalayas, of trenches deeper than the Grand Canyon, of undersea currents that may be swifter than our fastest streams, and of continental shelves that are continually growing and changing the balance of the continents on which we live.

The new frontiers in science and technology will continue to provide miraculous developments in electronics, computer control of manufacturing plants, supersonic commercial travel, communications, space travel . . . more Teletars and early Birds which will make possible instantaneous worldwide communications—provide a ringside seat to all important world events. What will business (your business or any business) be like only 18 years from now? Startling as it may seem, says Thomas J. Watson, Jr., of IBM, in a re-

cent speech, it is a plain fact that even without a radical acceleration in our productivity by 1985 we shall have a choice which past ages would never have believed possible. We could, Mr. Watson says, choose to:

Work only 22 hours a week.

Or 27 weeks a year.

Or let everybody retire at the age of 38 and still produce enough to give every American the standard of living he has today.

Whether one accepts this extreme formulation or not, it doesn't take much long-headedness to understand that all of this will present the dedicated American with a number of serious challenges and opportunities if he is to fulfill the key role of leadership and citizenship which rightly belongs to him.

In sketching for you briefly what I believe to be some of the major factors in the coming decade which will affect the way you live and transact your business, I believe the first thing is to understand the speed at which a change is occurring. To get a focus on this, take your mind back just 27 years ago.

Yes, "looking backward" to 1940—twenty-seven years ago, we were what was then called "the mature society." Over-production was the curse of the industrial revolution and mass unemployment its permanent cost. From the vantage point of an economy which has just reached the awesome total of some \$764 billion of gross national product, this is the moment to recall that 27 years ago our GNP was \$91 billion.

Nine-and-a-half million were unemployed, retail sales were 1/4 what they are today, personal savings less than 10 per cent of today's total.

Twenty-seven years ago, the League of Nations had died. The phony war was on. Neville Chamberlain's peace in our time had collapsed and Winston Churchill was still a hardly heard voice in the wings.

The United States was invulnerable behind the shield of two vast oceans. The neutrality act governed our international behavior. Joseph Stalin and Adolph Hitler had divided and swallowed Poland.

Twenty-seven years ago, 309,000 Americans traveled overseas. More than two million last year.

Twenty-seven years ago, three odd-ball scientists were trying by letter to interest President Roosevelt in the notion that the power of the atom could be harnessed. Japan was our biggest overseas purchaser of scrap metal.

Twenty-seven years ago, no one could have guessed that we were then on the edge of the most extraordinary scientific, technological and social change the world had ever witnessed, that our economy would triple while our population would grow by half.

Twenty-seven years ago, television was an oddity unveiled at a New York World's Fair in Flushing Meadows, whose theme was world peace. The calculator was the most advanced instrument used for data processing. Magnetic tape was a gleam in someone's eye. The DC-3 at 196 miles per hour was the workhorse of aviation and in something under twenty hours and three stops you could make it from New York to San Francisco.

Twenty-seven years ago, only one out of eight employed Americans had been in high school. Today, 4 out of 5 of high school age attend high school.

Twenty-seven years ago, only 4% of college age were in college. Today 35%.

Fifty-six million students—28% of population are enrolled in our schools and colleges—a number greater than entire population of France or Italy.

27 years ago, the rocket was a spectacular piece of fireworks invented by the Chinese. And the world population before the most devastating war in all of human history was 50 per cent less than it is today.

Do any of us really emotionally comprehend what is involved in the fact that a

vehicle launched by us has made its way to Mars? That man has walked in space or that our fierce ingenuity can package into one transportable device more explosive power than all the bombs that were dropped on Germany throughout the entire length of World War II?

Yet, unless we develop some deeper sense of what has happened just in the period of our own adult years, how can we even begin to comprehend how much change will occur during the next generation?

The rate of change is so accelerated that you must conservatively expect that much more will happen that is totally new within the next ten years that did during the last 27. It requires tremendous leaps of imagination to grasp the implications of the choices before us.

I feel confident that given a world at peace—which currently does not exist, as both Viet Nam and Near East remind us—and people willing to work for the things they need and want—more will happen in the next 15 years:

More change will occur.

More growth will take place.

More inventions added.

More distance covered.

More needs satisfied.

More goods made, shipped, sold, junked in the next 15 years than in the entire civilization called Rome, or that period of several hundred of Europe's most creative years called the Renaissance.

More in your next 15 years than in all of America's hundred which followed the Revolution and included in the Civil War.

We're just on the threshold of a great knowledge explosion.—90% of all scientists in the history of the world are alive and working today.

People are reaching out for knowledge . . . impressions . . . understanding. The typist in the office pool no longer is satisfied to spend her vacations at the nearest resort. Instead, she is admiring the art of Florence or visiting the ancient shrines of Athens and Rome.

There are two times the number enrolled in our colleges and universities as 10 years ago. Adult education classrooms are jammed full across the Nation.

Everything in our lives—including time—seems to be accelerating now at a rate we can barely keep up.

The doubling of world knowledge, for example, once took many centuries to accomplish. Now scientists tell us, it takes only 10 years.

It has taken a million years to reach ■ world population of 3 billion. It will take only 33 years more to reach 6 billion.

Indeed, we are experiencing swift . . . incessant . . . fundamental change. We may never be able to catch up with the future. It is important, I believe, that we constantly keep in mind the rapidly changing world in which we live . . . and in which we will continue to live. It is even more important that we help shape and direct the winds of change that blow about us.

It is terribly important that we recognize that the jet age—new scientific age and space age are a reality.

As you move along the inspiring pathway of American history you quickly discover the reason for the greatness of this Nation. It is the genius of the individual. The genius of the competent businessman that combines labor, capital and raw materials to produce a vast outpouring of goods for the enrichment of the lives of the masses.

It is the genius of the workingman, whose labor, self discipline and thrift are vital to the creation and operation of modern industry. It is the genius of the great doctor that frees children from crippling disease.

It is the genius of the talented architect that creates magnificent buildings. It is the genius of the devoted teacher and preacher—that inspires youth to greatness. It is the

genius of the dedicated public servant that enables good government to survive.

Those who built this Nation to its present greatness believed in the invincibility of intelligence, economy and hard work.

Guided by providence they entered a wilderness with vision, industry, and courage. They took the forked stick and made a steel plow. They took the rude sickle and made a reaper. They took the wagon and made an engine, an automobile, an airplane, a tractor. They made an iron thread into an ocean cable, rough type into great color printing presses, and steel beams into soaring skyscrapers. They made forest trails into magnificent highways. They put the little red schoolhouse and the little white church on a thousand hills.

America is great because individual men have freedom and equality, because individual men have been given the incentive to create, to produce, and to save, because individual men have been rewarded for their labor with a generous share of the goods, they helped to produce. America has taken its place among the great civilizations of history because the cornerstone upon which the republic rests is the social, economic, and spiritual betterment of individual men.

Today, we live in a world of threatening insecurity and exciting promise. But there is genius enough in the individuals in this great Nation to create political, social, and economic policies that will give us in material well-being and social enrichment a future that will exceed even the amazing progress of the past.

We are not in the bleak twilight of individualism, but in the brilliance of its morning.

We need to bring to the difficult problems of our time those heroic qualities of character, industry and self-discipline which have made our people strong and this nation great. We need constantly to reaffirm our deep faith in the dignity and worth of the individual man and of his creation by providence.

To men and women of great vision, dedication, courage and faith, I want to share this prayer—God give us men! A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands; men whom the lust of office does not kill; men whom the spoils of office cannot buy; men who possess opinion and a will; men who have honor; men who will not lie; men who can stand before a demagogue and damn his treacherous flatteries without blinking; tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog in public duty and in private thinking.—Josiah Gilbert Holland, 1819–1881.

My sincere personal appreciation to all of you—for the great honor, privilege and opportunity of sharing with you my faith in our country's brilliant future.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 548, S. 2388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emer-

gency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

If New Haven is a model city, God help the cities of America—

Said Mayor Richard Lee, shortly after a civil disturbance broke out there in August.

Unfortunately, his remark may be prophetic.

The administration, despite all the passionate sounding words, has failed to face up to the dimensions of the problems that beset our cities.

The President has spoken often—but his actions belie his words.

The Vice President at one point sounded a moving plea for a "Marshall plan" for slum areas.

Almost at the same time, the President urged upon the Congress an "all-out commitment" to prevent a "recurrence of the tragic events of this summer."

A few days later the Vice President explained that what he really had in mind was support limited to what the President requested in his budget message last January. Other than that, what he was really talking about was "a concept."

Reading the fine print of the President's statement, it turned out that all he too was seeking was a "commitment" to proposals approved and authorized for funds long before this summer. Some of the "urban aid programs" he specified have at best only an indirect bearing on urban problems. For example, included on his list was the food stamp program from which nine of the 20 largest cities secure no funds at all.

It was reminiscent of the President's budget message and his message on the war against poverty which lumped together a curious assortment of measures to arrive at the sum of \$25.6 billion "for programs directly aiding the poor." A look at the President's package revealed he had included such items as social security, railroad retirement benefits and, most audacious of all, the cost of highway construction—the very highways that in too many cases have closed off the ghettos from the rest of our cities.

There are times in the life of every man, and every nation, that demand the courage of conviction. I find it difficult to discern either courage or conviction in the actions of the administration to date. The banner is raised, at least intermittently, but there is no drive behind it. The administration marches backward.

Nowhere is the vacuum of leadership more apparent than in the transparent attempts to make the Congress the scapegoat for past and present failings.

Shortly after his call for "all-out commitment," the President made it explicitly clear that he was asking for no new programs, much less any additional funds to meet the urban crisis. Given the variety of programs already underway, new kinds of programs may not be necessary. But who will contend that any one of the existing programs or all of them together, can, given their present scale, make more than a dent in the situations they are designed to correct?

Nevertheless, despite the woeful inadequacy of present efforts, the President has challenged the Congress, not to respond to the urgencies of the need, but only to make any cuts it can over and beyond those he has made already. For the administration itself has made cuts, cuts far below the amounts Congress previously authorized in many programs that are essential elements in any long-range program to prevent an increasing division of our people into those who have and those who have not.

The administration knows the need is massive. When on a recent telecast an interviewer questioned the worth of the antipoverty program if it could not prevent the disorder in New Haven, Sargent Shriver, head of the Office of Economic Opportunity, was quick to point out that though the New Haven effort was indeed a "model" one, it was not "massive."

He was at some pains to explain that the war on poverty he heads cannot begin to meet the needs of the cities. He cited the very small fraction—well under 20 percent in most cases—of applications from cities that it is possible to fund on his agency's budget. Yet he defended the administration's failure to ask for funds more nearly commensurate with the task as a matter of being "realistic."

"Realistic" in what sense? Admittedly not in terms of the need involved. Certainly not in terms of prevention of the troubles that have plagued our cities. Perhaps in terms of immediate advantage in political jockeying, but clearly not in terms of what forthright and insistent leadership demands.

The mayors of our cities know this. Over a year ago Mayor John V. Lindsay testified at a congressional hearing that it would take \$50 billion to make New York City a thoroughly livable place. At the same hearings, Mayor James B. Cavanaugh of Detroit, then president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and also president of the National League of Cities, estimated \$53 billion a year for the next 10 years would be required to accomplish the rebirth of our cities.

Moreover, Mr. Shriver and other executive officials consistently ignore the commitments that Congress has, in some cases on its own initiative, already made in authorizing legislation.

The field of education affords an interesting illustration of the administration's approach.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides assistance to schools for programs for educationally disadvantaged children. According to

educational authorities, the programs launched under this title are bringing striking improvements in educational services to the children of the poor. Surely, quality of educational opportunity is basic to U.S. success in any war against poverty. But what has been the administration attitude toward the title I program?

It may come as a surprise to those who are persuaded that only congressional niggardliness holds back faster progress but the fact is the administration has never acted to implement fully the actions of Congress in this area. Quite the contrary, the administration keeps scaling down its effort, as Senator MORSE, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, has so ably pointed out.

In a statement to the Subcommittee on Labor-HEW Appropriations, Senator MORSE noted that in 1966, Congress acted to increase assistance under title I. Nonetheless, despite a specific increase in the authorization of 125 million above the administration's budget proposal, the administration requested no increase in the appropriation for fiscal 1967. Moreover, because of "budget decisions which had previously ignored program requirements," to use Senator MORSE's words, the administration further aggravated the fiscal 1967 situation by not permitting transfer within a State of funds allotted but unused by a school district.

And the story is the same for fiscal 1968. There is congressional authorization for a program of \$2.4 billion, but the administration has asked only \$1.2 billion, or one-half that amount.

The result, as Senator MORSE summed it up:

Thus, it is proposed that the program be financed for next year at 50 per cent of the authorized amount. In other words, it is proposed that we slide back from 70 per cent programs in 1967 to 50 per cent programs in 1968 at a time when we should be expanding our effort. The number of eligible children in the formula in fiscal year 1968 will rise from 6 million to 8 million with the result that the amount available per child will decrease again to a sum close to \$150 per child. Thus, in the three years the program will have been in operation the average amount available on a per capita basis for each educationally disadvantaged child in the formula will have gone steadily down from \$210, to \$170, to \$150, despite nominal increases in total appropriations.

It is now well established that educationally deprived children require resources far in excess of those needed for the average, middle-class child. In recognition of this principle, the authorizing legislation was based on a principle of increasing the financial resources available to educationally deprived children. This principle is being discarded at the very time that we are beginning to see positive signs of success in our treatment of the needs of educationally deprived children.

While title I is a glaring example of the talk one way, act another, approach of the administration, it is by no means the only one. At this point I list some of the programs having a direct bearing on the problems of our cities, showing the authorization approved by Congress, and the far lower amount requested by the President.

For supplementary educational cen-

ters and services, Congress authorized \$515 million, but the President asked only \$240 million. For higher educational facilities, including community colleges—in which I have had a very direct interest since my suggestion of that program—Congress authorized \$728 million, but the President asked only \$390 million.

For strengthening State departments of education, Congress authorized \$50 million, but the President asked only \$29.7 million.

For education of handicapped children, Congress authorized \$154.5 million, but the President asked only \$15 million, less than one-tenth of the authorized amount.

For contribution to student loan funds, Congress authorized \$225 million, but the President asked only \$190 million.

For HUD grants for neighborhood facilities, Congress authorized \$121 million, but the President asked only \$42 million.

For urban planning grants, Congress authorized \$33.8 million, but the President asked only \$50 million.

For grants for basic water and sewer facilities, Congress authorized \$400 million, but the President asked only \$165 million.

For community development training programs, Congress authorized \$30 million, but the President asked only \$5 million.

Is it "unrealistic" to expect that the President will ask for at least what Congress has already authorized? Is it "unrealistic" to hope that the President, as the leader, the one and only President of all the people, as he has so often pointed out—and correctly—will forgo, at least temporarily, the temptation to use Congress as the justification for surrender before the issue is even joined? Is it "unrealistic" to expect the Commander in Chief to realize that this war, no less than the war for freedom in South Vietnam, cannot be won "on the cheap?"

I do not think this war at home is lost. But it becomes vastly more difficult to win in the absence of leadership whose determination matches its words, whose sense of national purpose is equal to its sensitivity to political opportunity, whose commitment goes deeper than devotion to slogans.

I am not the only one in the Senate who stands ready to help the President to help the Nation to maintain progress toward the great goals that were charted by our forefathers. There are many—in and out of Congress—who are eager to work in that cause.

The newly formed urban coalition is evidence of a common concern that goes deeper than the ordinary groupings of party, or economic interest, or social association. As the coalition stated:

We believe the American people and the Congress must reorder national priorities, with a commitment of resources equal to the magnitude of the problems we face. . . . The crisis requires a new dimension of effort in both the public and private sectors, working together to provide jobs, housing, education and the other needs of the cities.

The coalition is right. The American people and Congress will have to take the

leadership since the President has failed to do so.

I have been happy to join with Senators CLARK and JAVITS in sponsoring the Emergency Employment Act. The basic proposal was first recommended by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty in 1964. Since then three Presidential commissions have supported the idea. Yet the administration inexplicably opposes it.

I hope the Senate will approve its passage. It is only a modest step but it is a key step in marshaling the resources of this Nation to deal effectively with the mounting urban crisis.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Alaska without losing my right to the floor. The Senator desires to speak briefly on the military construction bill which we will be voting on at 3 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we are about to vote on the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1968 to authorize the expenditure of \$2,251,225,000.

In addition, approval is granted for an increase in prior years in authority of \$29,963,000, making a total authorization of \$2,181,188,000.

While this is the largest military construction bill in years, I intend to support it.

I want to make clear that I have voted consistently against military appropriations which were obviously designed to carry on and escalate the illegal, immoral, and utterly unjustifiable war in Vietnam.

While the military construction bill contains some authorizations for work in Southeast Asia, the greater part of the authorizations deal with domestic establishments. In other words, they are for defense.

I am wholly for the defense of the United States. The tragedy is that when we went overseas and began to carry on offensive warfare in Southeast Asia, we were violating principles, traditions, and precedents which are without justification.

Thus, to the extent that this is a defense measure, I am happy to support it.

I definitely feel that the American people are not, many of them, fully aware that we are waging offensive war in Southeast Asia and that, contrary to

the official version, we are not the victims of aggression but are the aggressors there.

It is for that reason I have consistently voted against every action to increase, perpetuate, and extend our activities in Southeast Asia where we have no business being.

This bill, however, is an entirely different matter which provides largely for defense establishments at home, and they, of course, I support.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has an amendment which he would like to propose, I believe, before the vote on the military construction bill. I believe that he will be available, reasonably promptly. As there are a few matters which I should like to discuss for the RECORD, which I had no opportunity to finish on Friday afternoon last, I shall now proceed with an explanation of the bill.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my talk on Friday afternoon, I had outlined the work which the committee had done in preparing for floor action, and had drawn the conclusion that the committee believed it was necessary to maintain the OEO intact with a number of legislative improvements in its administration and in the authority given to it. I had also discussed at some length the next problem of coordination, which very much disturbed the committee and with respect to which we have made a number of legislative recommendations dealing with coordination at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Today, I should like to begin with a summary of the quite impressive accomplishments of the poverty program to date, before discussing somewhat more briefly the particular titles of the bill which are before the Senate for approval.

The war on poverty has chalked up many impressive accomplishments. Among these are, first, 1.3 million children participating in the Headstart program received educational, medical, and nutritional benefits from that program. I should point out that the Headstart program is divided into two major categories; namely, the summer program and the all-year-around program.

From an administrative point of view, these subdivisions present different but very real difficulties.

For the summer program, it has been possible in most, if not all instances, to obtain room to conduct the program in the schools of the public and private educational systems across the country because they are not, generally speaking, conducting school programs in the summer months. It has been much more difficult to obtain both space and teachers for the year-round Headstart pro-

grams. Accordingly, there have been many more youngsters in the summer Headstart programs than in the all-year-round programs. This is almost inevitable but it does result in the children—usually at the age of 3 or 4, sometimes at the age of 5—getting far less out of the program during the summer months than they could if they were in Headstart during the whole year.

On the other hand, they are apt to get teachers better skilled, because teachers in the schools are available for employment in Headstart, in many instances, in the summer months.

The Headstart program, it should be pointed out, is far from being primarily an educational program. The work of parent orientation and parent participation is very important, indeed. So are the regular physical examinations, including dental examinations, for children who in far too many instances have never seen a doctor, either for their parents or for themselves.

The public health aspects of the Headstart program are very important, indeed. There has been a tendency among some of the Headstart children to slide back after they get into the public school system. For this reason, in this legislation we are proposing to legitimize a program called Followthrough, which the OEO has been promoting around the country, in order to keep Headstart children up to the standards which they have achieved as a result of the work done for them in the Headstart program in the years before they went to school.

When we went into Mississippi, for example—as elsewhere in the country—we found that the medical and nutritional benefits of the Headstart program were most important. These, of course, are not primarily educational. There are far too many undernourished, malnourished, and hungry children in the United States today. The Headstart program has identified many of them and has made it possible for both public and private charities to provide the funds necessary to assure that these children obtain a healthy and adequate diet.

I shall not go into the statistical details at the moment, but the medical side of the Headstart program requires emphasis because so many of these children from underprivileged, poverty-stricken families have had not only no public health instruction, but their parents also have not had the benefit of any medical examinations or any medical advice as to how to rear them as healthy kids.

So I say that having 1.3 million children participating in Headstart and receiving these educational, medical, and nutritional benefits is an achievement. I believe we should all be very proud of it, and I commend the Office of Economic Opportunity and everybody who worked with it, including the parents of these children, all over the country for having lifted the sights of both parents and children, so that the youngsters can go on in the educational system of the country with some assurance that they will be able to benefit from it, and not constantly fall behind, as has been the case with so many underprivileged chil-

dren from poverty families before the Headstart program was initiated.

The second achievement of the war on poverty has been the Job Corps centers. Nearly 70,000 men and women have graduated from the Job Corps centers all the way across the country. They are, generally speaking, of three kinds.

There are the urban residential centers.

There are the conservation centers, generally speaking, are located in our national forests or national parks, or the State forests or national parks. Very much of the work done is in supplementing the always inadequate appropriations made by both the State and Federal Governments to the upkeep and maintenance of these great conservation areas.

There are a few Job Corps demonstration centers, and the members of the committee visited a number of these centers. I myself went to the women's center in Albuquerque, N. Mex., and found that while it had been criticized, and perhaps criticized for some reason, for inefficient administration and generally disciplinary conditions which left much to be desired, by the time I got down there in the spring of this year I was satisfied that all those defects had been remedied. I did not take the say-so of the faculty which was in charge of the project or even of the representative of the Bell-Packard Co., the well-known industrial concern from the former Packard Automobile Co. and the Bell Aircraft Co., who are operating a women's center on a contract basis. This is only one example of how private enterprise has been involved in the program. Bell-Packard was making a legitimate profit in operating the center. I am glad they were. It was not exorbitant. This is not charity work. It was an experienced business contractor moving into an area in which it had a certain amount of experience by reason of its aircraft, automobiles, and other businesses beforehand.

Of these 70,000 men and women who graduated from Job Corps centers—they go in no earlier than age 16 and come out no later than age 21—70 percent have moved directly from graduation into jobs, many of them taking jobs for the first time in their lives. That 70 percent does not include young women—and there were many women in the Job Corps; 23 percent of the Job Corps enrollees are women—who married and went away to raise families of their own and did not join the labor force. So the 70 percent figure is extremely conservative.

A number in the 70 percent went into military service. A number could not have gotten into the military service before they went into the Job Corps because they had neither the physical nor the mental capability to be accepted by one of the Armed Forces.

So despite the criticism that comes with respect to the Job Corps—some of which comes from the minority members of the committee—I am sure the Job Corps experience will stand the test today and has been a good experience on the whole.

I should perhaps stress again that nobody on the committee, least of all I, is

of the view that the Job Corps or any other agency here is perfect.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote on the military construction authorization bill, which is to take place, by special order, at 3 o'clock p.m., today, the amendment (No. 324) which the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is about to offer to the pending bill be voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous-consent order entered not too many moments ago, it was agreed that we would vote on the pending amendment immediately after the vote on the military construction bill.

Thereafter, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] pointed out to me that this particular amendment would nullify a provision which the committee had agreed to accept at the urging of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], who is out of town and who will not be back until tomorrow. We hope to persuade him not to oppose the amendment but we do not know.

I have conferred with the Senator from Washington, the Senator from Vermont, and the majority leader. They have said that it would be agreeable to them if the vote could be postponed until tomorrow when the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] will return.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement to vote on the Jackson amendment this afternoon may be rescinded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. I renew my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is approved.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Jackson amendment may take place not later than 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I did not hear the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, so as not to embarrass the Senator from Colorado or myself I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request to vote on the Jackson amendment not later than 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield on that point?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I presume that, if there is any delay in the return of the Senator from California, we could have an extension of time.

Mr. CLARK. Yes, indeed; but I am assured by the Republican staff that he will be here. Yes, of course.

The agreement was later reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Tuesday, September 26, 1967, at not later than 2:30 o'clock p.m., the Senate shall proceed to vote on Amendment No. 324 (offered by Mr. JACKSON and others) to the bill S. 2388, to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 324

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 324, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] proposes an amendment, for himself and others, as follows:

On page 9, after line 8, amend section 106 by the addition of a new subsection to read as follows:

"(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those enrollees are assigned to conservation centers, as described in section 107, or to other centers or projects where their work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, development, or management of public natural resources or recreational areas and is performed under the direction of personnel of agencies regularly responsible for those functions."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I offered this amendment to S. 2388 because I feel that the committee's recommendation to drop the requirement that 40 percent of the male Job Corps enrollees be assigned in conservation centers would place in jeopardy a most promising facet of the Nation's war on poverty. President

Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 required that at any one time no less than 40 percent of the Job Corps enrollees be assigned to conservation centers. This was later changed to be 40 percent of the male enrollees. The administration's proposal this year, introduced as S. 1545, would have continued this requirement.

The committee's report states:

The requirement that at least 40 percent of all male enrollees be assigned to conservation centers is dropped in order to permit more flexibility in establishing demonstration centers.

An analysis of the situation reveals that the reasoning behind this statement is not correct. S. 2388 would limit total Job Corps enrollment to 45,000 during fiscal year 1968, and at least 25 percent of these must be women. Forty percent of the remaining 33,750 spaces would be only 13,500. Based on the June 30 enrollment of more than 16,000 in conservation centers, this 13,500 minimum requirement would leave 2,500 spaces at conservation centers which could be used to provide the flexibility in establishing demonstration centers.

In addition, I believe that the "flexibility" which the committee seeks already exists. At this time there are two conservation centers which are also "demonstration centers": Liberty Park in New Jersey, demonstrating accelerated training in general education development—high school equivalency—and Jacobs Creek in Tennessee, demonstrating heavy equipment operation training.

The question may arise just how good a job are these conservation centers doing? There are 90 of them scattered across our land, involving 38 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Six of them are State related centers, three actually being operated by the States of California, Hawaii, and North Dakota. Three are run by Puerto Rico. The Forest Service has 47 conservation centers, and the remainder are administered by resource agencies in the Department of the Interior.

Conservation centers are small in size, ranging from 112 to 256 corpsmen per center. Urban Job Corps centers are much larger, ranging from 700 to 3,000 corpsmen per center. The conservation centers provide for a much closer, personal working relationship between staff and corpsmen. Many staff members actually reside at these rural centers. The presence of the staff families develops an atmosphere with fewer stresses, enabling corpsmen to devote their energies to learning. The indepth knowledge of each corpsman's problems, and the esprit de corps developed in this environment, have been highly effective in obtaining needed social adjustment. In addition to removing disadvantaged youth from undesirable neighborhood environments and influences, conservation centers have also proved to be a good opportunity for the rural disadvantaged youth who cannot compete well in an urban environment.

The cost of operating the conservation centers is 20 percent less per corpsman man-year than it is in the larger urban centers. The savings accrued by having

the 16,000 young men assigned to conservation centers rather than urban centers exceeds \$22 million per year, not even including the value of conservation work they perform and other benefits the corpsmen receive. As I will show later, these benefits accruing to the public lands are considerable.

As the Senate may know, the least educated youth entering Job Corps have been assigned to conservation centers. Most corpsmen who cannot read at the seventh-grade level have been assigned to conservation centers. Thirty-five percent of them cannot read or write and 40 percent are under fourth-grade level. The educational gains, 1.5 times better than public school norm in math and 1.25 times better in reading, are slightly less than at men's urban centers. When you consider, however, the selective assignment giving conservation centers 35 percent who cannot read or write, compared to 8 percent in urban centers, the achievements are remarkable.

Vocational training in conservation centers takes place primarily in an on-the-job situation. Work skills training directed toward conservation work has provided recreation and other resource improvements valued at \$32 million through July of this year. This includes construction of roads and trails, public recreation areas, range and wildlife improvements, bridges and buildings, and roadside beautification.

The widespread geographical location of conservation centers and the tools, equipment, and transportation available at these centers present a capability to assist communities in times of disaster, such as flood, fire, tornado, and so forth. A few examples of these include:

Corpsmen contributed more than 10,000 man-days of firefighting during the recent forest fire disaster in the Pacific Northwest. Corpsmen were actively working in every phase of firefighting from operating pumps to constructing firelines. Corpsmen worked an average of 12 hours a day and lived in fire camps near the blazes. All the corpsmen had received training at their centers in fire behavior and firefighting. Officials reported:

The Job Corpsmen have turned in top notch performance in fighting these fires. They are enthusiastic, well trained, and hard working young men.

Six hundred and eighty corpsmen man-days contributed to cleanup of tornado aftermath in Topeka, Kans., June 1966.

Eight hundred and ten corpsmen man-days contributed to emergency assistance to individual families, temporary repair to houses and general cleanup after tornado in Belmond, Iowa, August 1966.

Other instances include flood prevention and cleanup, search and rescue operation for lost persons and accident victims, emergency repair and reconstruction of burned homes, churches, and farms.

With few exceptions, conservation centers have been remarkably free of adverse community reaction. High

standards of corpsmen discipline have been maintained since the start of the program. Most conservation centers have one or more community relations councils as a means of maintaining communication with adjacent communities. Council members have repeatedly stepped in to assist in overcoming any community difficulties which have arisen.

As an example of good community relations is the case in September of 1966 at the Blue Jay Corps Conservation Center in Forest County, Pa. There were 77 young men who were not eligible to receive Government-paid trips home for Christmas as their annual leave. Local citizens launched a drive in the area to raise \$2,100 needed to pay for these trips. I believe this reflects the good will created by these young men.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in conclusion, I express my hope that the manager of the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senate will accept this amendment this afternoon. I believe that the flexibility for demonstration centers which is desired can exist without jeopardizing one of the real significant achievements of the program, the conservation center portion of the Job Corps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Dr. Spencer M. Smith, secretary of the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, a telegram from the New York State Conservation Council, and an editorial entitled "Job Corps Conservation" from the Washington Post of September 24, all urging that the requirement for 40 percent of the male enrollees to conservation centers be retained.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENS COMMITTEE

ON NATURAL RESOURCES,

Washington, D.C., September 21, 1967.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We respectfully ask and urge your support for the Jackson amendment to S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity amendments of 1967, which is to be considered shortly on the floor of the Senate.

Senator Jackson, on behalf of himself and Senators Morse, Burdick, Nelson and Proxmire, submitted his amendment to the Senate on September 19 (CR 13179), which would restore the requirement that 40% of the male enrollees of the Job Corps at any one time be assigned to Conservation Centers. This requirement is contained in the present statute and no recommendation by the administration has been made to exclude it. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare deleted this requirement in their Report #548, page 15, item 4.

To eliminate the 40% requirement would reduce the effectiveness of the Conservation Centers. The natural resources agencies of the government cannot properly train and utilize the services of the enrollees without some assurance of continuance, since much of the capital employed is not mobile, and the programs by their very nature must be long range.

Ironically, at a time when many of the original problems have been overcome, the

continuance of the program is jeopardized. The critics have dramatized many of the difficulties but few of the accomplishments. Also, standards of success are urged that bear little relationship to, or understanding of, the dimensions of the task.

Conservationists have observed closely the programs of the Conservation Centers and feel that the performance has been effective and worthy of continued support.

Sincerely,

SPENCER M. SMITH, Jr.,
Secretary.

NEW YORK STATE
CONSERVATION COUNCIL,
Glens Falls, N.Y., September 22, 1967.

Senator JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request your support of Senator Jackson's amendments 324 to S. 2388 which would restore provision that 40 percent of males hired would be assigned to conservation centers. Copy to Robert Kennedy and Javits.

EDMUND MORETTE,
President.

MARTIN TURNER,
STEPHEN GEHRING,
SHERRY ALLEN,
LORRELL COOK,
W. J. JENKINS,
Vice Presidents.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 24, 1967]

JOB CORPS CONSERVATION

Senator Jackson has made an impressive plea for continuation of the Job Corps Conservation Centers without curtailment. The Job Corps is about equally divided between Conservation Centers and Urban Centers, with some units in each category serving as Demonstration Centers. In reporting the so-called Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, however, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee eliminated the clause under which 40 per cent of the male Job Corps enrollees must be assigned to the conservation centers. Fearing that this would lead to a change of policy, Senator Jackson is seeking to restore the requirement.

We think there is good reason to keep the 83 rural centers in operation. They have taken the least educated youths entering the Job Corps. About 35 per cent of them cannot read or write. The literacy of another 40 per cent is below the fourth grade level. Yet these youngsters have made remarkable educational gains and have been taught manual skills in the construction of trails, campgrounds, buildings, wildlife projects and so forth. Their removal from undesirable urban environments to small conservation centers with helpful staffs is said to have given many youths new motivation.

Senator Jackson and others have described these centers as the most successful part of the Job Corps program. Yet they operate with a lower-than-average cost per enrollee, and the work they perform has obvious value. In many instances the youths in the Conservation Centers have assisted local communities afflicted by fires, tornadoes and floods, and their work in fighting forest fires has been outstanding.

Congress should not take a chance on being misunderstood by eliminating the clause which has kept an even balance between urban and rural Job Corps centers.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, the present provision in the pending bill which removes the 40-percent requirement for Job Corps enrollment in a conservation center was placed in the bill because the committee wanted to assure that under the limited budget for the Job Corps,

which is only \$295 million, OEO might close the few unsuccessful centers and use that money to demonstrate the use of nonresidential facilities and other new techniques in dealing with poor youths eligible for the Job Corps.

The second reason for the committee provision was that in this connection we adopted the two amendments proposed by the minority to demonstrate the use of residential vocational skill centers and special centers dealing with youths with serious behavioral problems.

Of course, I feel committed to the position which I reluctantly agreed to at the request of the minority. I cannot accept the proposed amendment on behalf of the committee. Personally, I am extremely sympathetic to it, and I know that conservation interests in my own State and elsewhere would be much pleased if it were passed.

Two members of the minority are in the Chamber, one of whom at least—the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]—was active in arranging for the changes in the present act which the Senator from Washington would presently like to see removed. I would be very happy, indeed, having stated why the changes were made, to leave to my friends on the other side of the aisle the defense of the committee position, which personally I do not favor. But in the interest of harmony, and to report a bill with which people would agree, I felt that I could go along with this matter.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I merely wish to say that I appreciate fully the problem that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania had in committee in connection with reporting the bill.

I believe that the 40-percent provision has worked very well—it has worked well for the Job Corps men. It is the finest thing in the world for young men who come off the streets of the big cities to have a chance to work outdoors. I believe the record of performance in connection with their assignment at these conservation centers has been outstanding as compared with some of those assigned to the urban centers.

I should also like to observe that they have made a substantial contribution. As I indicated in my opening remarks, some \$32 million equivalent has been added to our conservation programs.

So, on all counts—for the benefit of the young men involved and from the standpoint of the conservation of our own natural resources as well as the human resources involved—it seems to me that this is a pretty sound policy to pursue.

I would hate to see a deviation from the practice and the custom that has been established by statute over the past several years.

Mr. President, before yielding, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] be added as a cosponsor of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield the floor to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I intend to speak very briefly.

I believe that some of us on the minority side of the aisle were persuaded that in many of the Job Corps camps—particularly the conservation camps—the young men came and left without receiving any training or acquiring any skill whatever. I believe the head of the Job Corps indicated that that was true in many instances.

However, I should like to point out that since Mr. Kelly, the present Director of the Job Corps, assumed responsibility, I have been persuaded that there will be a great change in the operations of these camps. Indeed, great change has already taken place. Many staff members have been replaced by more competent individuals. The legislation has been tightened up in committee as a result of some amendments which I offered, and which I will discuss in greater detail later this afternoon.

Because of these factors, I shall not oppose the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from Vermont. I am sorry that I did not have an opportunity to speak to him prior to the introduction of the amendment. I know that he has taken a keen interest in the entire Job Corps effort, and I thank him for the attitude and the stand he has taken with respect to the pending amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I, too, thank my friend, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, for the position he has just taken with respect to the pending amendment.

Frankly, I was embarrassed because I felt I was bound by the committee action—I certainly could not accept it. On the other hand, I must admit that the points made by the Senator from Washington are most persuasive to me.

It is a pleasure to find that the ranking minority member of the committee takes the same view of this matter. We will have no problem with respect to whether I should be out there fighting hard against the pending amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I am not sure that I can speak for the minority, but expressing a personal view, I have no objection to the pending amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Before the Jackson amendment was brought before the Senate, I had covered two of the principal accomplishments of the war on poverty dealing with the Headstart program and the Peace Corps program. A third accomplishment is that at least 300,000 poor people have received advice and services provided by the legal services program. This, I believe, is the first time in American history when the organized legal profession has come to the assistance of the poor people of America without any real compensation.

The American Bar Association and the bar associations in the various States and cities are to be highly commended for the way in which they have picked up the legal services program and, under their initiative, caused it to be spread all over the United States.

Mr. President, I point out that the legal services rendered are entirely civil legal services. Voluntary defenders and public defenders in practically all the criminal courts in the country now represent without fee the indigent poor accused of crime.

These 300,000 poor people who have been helped by the legal services program are infinitely better off knowing their rights than they could have been before.

The kinds of cases handled deal with such varied areas of law as landlord-tenant relationships, small loan contracts, and various other types of installment credit, areas where the poor very rarely read the fine print of a contract before they sign, often for unconscionable payments to landlords who all too frequently do not keep the premises in proper repair, or at disproportionate interest rates, which we hope will be helped by the truth-in-lending law which has been passed by the Senate.

Mr. President, since I understand that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] wishes to address some questions respecting the military construction bill to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator in charge of that bill, and since the Senate will be voting on it at 3 o'clock p.m., I yield the floor.

Mr. President, not to be wearisome, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STOKELY CARMICHAEL

Mr. DOMINICK. There has been a considerable amount of discussion in recent weeks concerning Mr. Stokely Carmichael, and whether he has violated any laws of the Federal Government. There has been some question as to whether quotations which have been attributed to him are, in fact, accurate.

Recently, through the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, I received a copy of a weekly review entitled "Gramma," which is the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba. It contains some messages, reportedly verbatim, from Mr. Carmichael addressed to the United States and to the people of the world. The review contains direct quotations from him.

Some of them seem to me to be of sufficient import that we should study them carefully to see whether it would be advisable for the Justice Department to take some action. Let me quote one of them, where he is talking about the black liberation movement:

We will not fight for Vietnam, Santo Domingo, or anywhere else in the world. Our fight will be inside the United States.

He goes on to say:

While we are fighting to destroy imperialism from the inside, we know you will be fighting from the outside.

This was said in a press conference in Cuba in talking to Castroites there.

It strikes me, Mr. President, that this is of sufficient import to warrant Senators, and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to study Carmichael's statements.

I have been in touch with the Department of Justice on this question of whether he has violated any Federal laws, and have been told that in their opinion, he has not.

However, I am frank to say that I do not understand their comments. I have reviewed the various pertinent titles in the United States Code and it seems to me that Carmichael has violated at least two or three sections of the Code and that some action should be initiated against him if, as, and when he comes back within our jurisdiction.

I do not believe that we can continue to have people going around the world, or in this country, advocating violence as a method of curing either real or fancied grievances.

To the extent that we continue to permit this to happen, we shall continue to have trouble within our cities and in the country generally.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete weekly review of the official organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, which is dated August 13, 1967, reporting on the press conference held by Stokely Carmichael in Cuba.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO MESSAGES FROM CARMICHAEL

Negro leader Stokely Carmichael of the United States spoke over Radio Havana Cuba addressing words of greeting to the courageous veteran guerrilla leader, Ernesto Che Guevara wherever he may be. He also sent a message of salutation to "our comrades in the armed struggle against imperialism and racism." The two messages follow:

TO MY FELLOW COMRADE CHE

HAVANA, CUBA,
August 1, 1967.

To my fellow comrade Che:

The African-Americans inside the United States have a great deal of admiration for you. We eagerly await your writings in order to read them, digest them and plan our tactics based on them.

We want you to know, wherever you are, that you are an inspiration not only to the Blacks inside the U.S. by to the Liberation Struggle around the world. Please keep on fighting because by your fighting you are inspiring us. Do not despair, my comrade.

We will win.

STOKELY CARMICHAEL.

"We are moving toward urban guerrilla warfare within the United States since there is no other way to obtain our homes, our lands, and our rights. For 400 years, the Negro population of the U.S. has tried to coexist, but to no avail. We have no other alternative but to take up arms in order to attain liberation."

The speaker was Stokely Carmichael, honorary delegate to the First Conference of OLAS, a man who at the moment personifies the best of the Negro people's struggle in the United States.

The U.S. Negro leader gave an interesting press conference in which he answered with

extraordinary forthrightness, questions put by both local reporters and foreign correspondents.

Many of his answers, given with the simplicity, honesty and firmness of a genuine revolutionary leader, drew rounds of applause.

Accompanying Carmichael were his comrades of the SNCC (Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee) Julius Lester and George Ware.

Carmichael continued: "For 400 years, the Negro population in our country has lived under the most brutal Fascism ever known. What is now happening from New York to California and from Canada to Mexico is nothing but the response of rebellion to the constant aggressions we have been subjected to." He gave a brief explanation of what Black Power consists of:

"It is the union of the Negro population to fight for liberation by any means whatsoever. It is the union of the Negro population of the U.S. with the oppressed peoples of the rest of the world. It is the struggle against capitalism and imperialism that oppress us from within and oppress you from without."

Questioned as to the possible coordination of the Negro struggle with that of the other peoples, he replied:

"Our very presence here indicates that." Stokely once again picked up the Negro theme:

"When we created our organization, conditions were different in the struggle of the Negro people of the United States. That is why we called it "non-violent." It was the year 1960 and Dr. Martin Luther King was the leading figure of the movement. He was a pacifist and for that reason we had to adopt that name. But we did not believe in non-violence at the time, and we organized our people telling them that we would have to use our weapons.

"In 1965, following the Watts revolt, non-violence ceased to be a point worthy of discussion. It became necessary to adopt other means of struggle."

VIETNAM: OUR BROTHER IN STRUGGLE

The Negro leader spoke of the war being waged by the U.S. against the Vietnamese people.

"We don't want to serve as cannon fodder for an imperialist cause. That is why we refuse to do compulsory military service. We will not take up arms against the Vietnamese people because they have not done anything against us and because they are not to blame for the exploitation that we have been subjected to. The people of Viet Nam are our brothers in struggle because we are both fighting against the structure oppressing us."

Explaining that 40% of the U.S. frontline troops are Negroes, he added: "The United States has taught us to kill. Upon their return, our brothers will put this teaching to good use in the cities."

This statement brought forth a murmur of excitement among national and foreign newspapermen attending the conference. A series of questions followed which Carmichael answered with great spirit.

"In the U.S. the soldiers will have to fight a hand to hand combat with us and we'll wipe them out.

"The insurrection in Detroit is hurting the U.S. economically.

"Even if the authorities make it difficult for us to obtain arms for the struggle, we can always get them.

"The joint struggle of the peoples against the U.S. will destroy the monster.

"Only recently, Martin Luther King supported the sending of troops in Detroit. This shows that in fact he is against the Negroes.

"The only condition under which we would accept having a separate territory in the U.S. would be the existence of nuclear bombs and rockets in both territories.

ated by this Act having jurisdiction of like cases, matters, and duties.

An existing laws in the Canal Zone governing practice and procedure in existing courts shall be applicable and adapted to the practice and procedure in the new courts.

The Circuit Court of Appeals of the Fifth Circuit of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review, revise, modify, reverse, or affirm the final judgments and decrees of the District Court of the Canal Zone and to render such judgments as in the opinion of the said appellate court should have been rendered by the trial court in all actions and proceedings in which the Constitution, or any statute, treaty, title, right, or privilege of the United States, is involved and a right thereunder denied, and in cases in which the value in controversy exceeds one thousand dollars, to be ascertained by the oath of either party, or by other competent evidence, and also in criminal causes wherein the offense charged is punishable as a felony. And such appellate jurisdiction, subject to the right of review by or appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States as in other cases authorized by law, may be exercised by said circuit court of appeals in the same manner, under the same regulations, and by the same procedure as nearly as practicable as is done in reviewing the final judgments and decrees of the district courts of the United States.

Sec. 10. That after the Panama Canal shall have been completed and opened for operation the governor of the Panama Canal shall have the right to make such rules and regulations, subject to the approval of the President, touching the right of any person to remain upon or pass over any part of the Canal Zone as may be necessary. Any person violating any of such rules or regulations shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction in the District Court of the Canal Zone shall be punished by a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or by imprisonment not exceeding a year, or both, in the discretion of the court. It shall be unlawful for any person, by any means or in any way, to injure or obstruct, or attempt to injure or obstruct, any part of the Panama Canal or the locks thereof or the approaches thereto. Any person violating this provision shall be guilty of a felony, and on conviction in the District Court of the Canal Zone shall be punished by a fine not exceeding ten thousand dollars or by imprisonment not exceeding twenty years, or both, in the discretion of the court. If the act shall cause the death of any person within a year and a day thereafter, the person so convicted shall be guilty of murder and shall be punished accordingly.

Sec. 11. That section five of the Act to regulate commerce, approved February fourth, eighteen hundred and eighty-seven, as heretofore amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new paragraph at the end thereof, as follows:

"From and after the first day of July, nineteen hundred and fourteen it shall be unlawful for any railroad company or other common carrier subject to the Act to regulate commerce to own, lease, operate, control, or have any interest whatsoever (by stock ownership or otherwise, either directly, indirectly, through any holding company, or by stockholders or directors in common, or in any other manner) in any common carrier by water operated through the Panama Canal or elsewhere with which said railroad or other carrier aforesaid does or may compete for traffic or any vessel carrying freight or passengers upon said water route or elsewhere with which said railroad or other carrier aforesaid does or may compete for traffic; and in case of the violation of this provision each day in which such violation continues shall be deemed a separate offense."

Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the Interstate Commerce Commission to deter-

mine questions of fact as to the competition or possibility of competition, after full hearing, on the application of any railroad company or other carrier. Such application may be filed for the purpose of determining whether any existing service is in violation of this section and pray for an order permitting the continuance of any vessel or vessels already in operation, or for the purpose of asking an order to install new service not in conflict with the provisions of this paragraph. The commission may on its own motion or the application of any shipper institute proceedings to inquire into the operation of any vessel in use by any railroad or other carrier which has not applied to the commission and had the question of competition or the possibility of competition determined as herein provided. In all such cases the order of said commission shall be final.

If the Interstate Commerce Commission shall be of the opinion that any such existing specified service by water other than through the Panama Canal is being operated in the interest of the public and is of advantage to the convenience and commerce of the people, and that such extension will neither exclude, prevent, nor reduce competition on the route by water under consideration, the Interstate Commerce Commission may, by order, extend the time during which such service by water may continue to be operated beyond July first, nineteen hundred and fourteen. In every case of such extension the rates, schedules, and practices of such water carrier shall be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and shall be subject to the act to regulate commerce and all amendments thereof in the same manner and to the same extent as is the railroad or other common carrier controlling such water carrier or interested in any manner in its operation: *Provided*, Any application for extension under the terms of this provision filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission prior to July first, nineteen hundred and fourteen, but for any reason not heard and disposed of before said date, may be considered and granted thereafter.

No vessel permitted to engage in the coastwise or foreign trade of the United States shall be permitted to enter or pass through said canal if such ship is owned, chartered, operated, or controlled by any person or company which is doing business in violation of the provisions of the Act of Congress approved July second, eighteen hundred and ninety, entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," or the provisions of sections seventy-three to seventy-seven, both inclusive, of an Act approved August twenty-seventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-four, entitled "An Act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes," or the provisions of any other Act of Congress amending or supplementing the said Act of July second, eighteen hundred and ninety, commonly known as the Sherman Antitrust Act, and amendments thereto, or said sections of the Act of August twenty-seventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-four. The question of fact may be determined by the judgment of any court of the United States of competent jurisdiction in any cause pending before it to which the owners or operators of such ship are parties. Suit may be brought by any shipper or by the Attorney General of the United States.

That section six of said Act to regulate commerce, as heretofore amended, is hereby amended by adding a new paragraph at the end thereof, as follows:

"When property may be or is transported from point to point in the United States by rail and water through the Panama Canal or otherwise, the transportation being by a common carrier or carriers, and not entirely within the limits of a single State, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall have jurisdiction of such transportation and of the

carriers, both by rail and by water, which may or do engage in the same, in the following particulars, in addition to the jurisdiction given by the Act to regulate commerce, as amended June eighteenth, nineteen hundred and ten:

"(a) To establish physical connection between the lines of the rail carrier and the dock of the water carrier by directing the rail carrier to make suitable connection between its line and a track or tracks which have been constructed from the dock to the limits of its right of way, or by directing either or both the rail and water carrier, individually or in connection with one another, to construct and connect with the lines of the rail carrier a spur track or tracks to the dock. This provision shall only apply where such connection is reasonably practicable, can be made with safety to the public, and where the amount of business to be handled is sufficient to justify the outlay.

"The commission shall have full authority to determine the terms and conditions upon which these connecting tracks, when constructed, shall be operated, and it may, either in the construction or the operation of such tracks, determine what sum shall be paid to or by either carrier. The provisions of this paragraph shall extend to cases where the dock is owned by other parties than the carrier involved.

"(b) To establish through routes and maximum joint rates between and over such rail and water lines, and to determine all the terms and conditions under which such lines shall be operated in the handling of the traffic embraced.

"(c) To establish maximum proportional rates by rail to and from the ports to which the traffic is brought, or from which it is taken by the water carrier, and to determine to what traffic and in connection with what vessels and upon what terms and conditions such rates shall apply. By proportional rates are meant those which differ from the corresponding local rates to and from the port and which apply only to traffic which has been brought to the port or is carried from the port by a common carrier by water.

"(d) If any rail carrier subject to the Act to regulate commerce enters into arrangements with any water carrier operating from a port in the United States to a foreign country, through the Panama Canal or otherwise, for the handling of through business between interior points of the United States and such foreign country, the Interstate Commerce Commission may require such railway to enter into similar arrangements with any or all other lines of steamships operating from said port to the same foreign country."

The orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating to this section shall only be made upon formal complaint or in proceedings instituted by the commission of its own motion and after full hearing. The orders provided for in the two amendments to the Act to regulate commerce enacted in this section shall be served in the same manner and enforced by the same penalties and proceedings as are the orders of the commission made under the provisions of section fifteen of the Act to regulate commerce, as amended June eighteenth, nineteen hundred and ten, and they may be conditioned for the payment of any sum or the giving of security for the payment of any sum or the discharge of any obligation which may be required by the terms of said order.

Sec. 12. That all laws and treaties relating to the extradition of persons accused of crime in force in the United States, to the extent that they may not be in conflict with or superseded by any special treaty entered into between the United States and the Republic of Panama with respect to the Canal Zone, and all laws relating to the rendition of fugitives from justice as between the several States and Territories of the United

States, shall extend to and be considered in force in the Canal Zone, and for such purposes and such purposes only the Canal Zone shall be considered and treated as an organized Territory of the United States.

SEC. 13. That in time of war in which the United States shall be engaged, or when, in the opinion of the President, war is imminent, such officer of the Army as the President may designate shall, upon the order of the President, assume and have exclusive authority and jurisdiction over the operation of the Panama Canal and all of its adjuncts, appendants, and appurtenances, including the entire control and government of the Canal Zone, and during a continuance of such condition the governor of the Panama Canal shall, in all respects and particulars as to the operation of such Panama Canal, and all duties, matters, and transactions affecting the Canal Zone, be subject to the order and direction of such officer of the Army.

SEC. 14. That this Act shall be known as, and referred to as, the Panama Canal Act, and the right to alter, amend, or repeal any or all of its provisions or to extend, modify, or annul any rule or regulation made under its authority is expressly reserved.

Approved, August 24, 1912.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like now briefly to complete my presentation of the bill.

For the information of Senators, I understand that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] will want to represent the point of view of the minority on the committee.

It is my information that there will be no possibility of any votes this afternoon, but it is anticipated that there will be a good many votes tomorrow.

Mr. President, earlier today, I spoke about some of the impressive accomplishments of the war on poverty, mentioning the Headstart program, the Job Corps, and legal services.

I should now like to refer to the fourth accomplishment which deals with the VISTA volunteers. These are young men and young women who have enlisted in the Volunteers in Service to America who have served or are currently serving at least a year in rural poverty areas, in urban slums, on Indian reservations, and with the migrant poor.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has indicated some disenchantment with certain activities of the VISTA volunteers in West Virginia. It may well be that most of those problems arise from the conduct of Appalachian volunteers who are not recruited and are not operating under the poverty program.

I do not want to take further time at this point with regard to VISTA other than to say I have personally followed the training and the work of the VISTA volunteers all over the country, and everywhere the subcommittee went in connection with our hearings, and also during the course of the Washington

hearings, we had occasion to examine and test the effectiveness of its work.

I think I can say without legitimate fear of contradiction that, with very, very few exceptions—in fact, one could name them with far fewer than the fingers of one's hand—the VISTA volunteers have been extraordinarily successful in their accomplishments. They are the domestic equivalent of the Peace Corps. They are motivated by the same ideals. They are given nearly identical training, although, of course, their training goes to areas in the United States where they expect to be assigned.

As we followed their work, I found, at least, that they have given almost uniform satisfaction in every poverty community they have served.

I personally feel that the 3,000 VISTA volunteers constitute a real star in the crown of the Director of the war on poverty.

A fifth area where there has been a substantial achievement is in the fact that 30,000 poor but talented high school students are participating in the Upward Bound program, which equips them for the opportunity of attending college. One of the concerns which we have had with respect to children from poverty families who went into high school, and in many cases to college, was the lack of any motivation for the bright ones to go on and take college training and undertake a college career.

A great many of these young men and women have plenty of talent to go through college. Many of them had financial difficulties in their families, which made it difficult for them to raise tuition money, but a great many more were not motivated because it had not occurred to them that they were college material. These students who were brought into the Upward Bound program—30,000 of them—have been given that motivation, through on-campus training which they have received during the summers of their junior and senior high school years, and to some extent during the course of the academic year, also.

I have seen a great many of these young people. A good many of them come down to Washington from time to time. When we went to Johnstown, Pa., with the subcommittee not too long ago we had a magnificent exposition of the work which is being done in Upward Bound there under a very able professor in one of the institutions of higher learning.

I am confident, from what I have seen myself, that this Upward Bound program has helped take the chains of poverty off the feet and hands of many a talented high school student who never thought, before this program was begun, that he would go on to college.

A sixth achievement of the war on poverty deals with the Neighborhood Youth Corps. There, over the years since that program began, more than 900,000 boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 21 have received full-time or part-time work—experience in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This work experience has been confined to two categories; first, among these who are still in high school or college; and, second, work-experience for those who dropped out of school and did not attend college.

There have been "bugs," to use the vernacular, in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, but I believe we will be able to sustain, during the course of the debate, the proposition that these 900,000 boys and girls who went through the experience of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program came out of it far better citizens than they were when they went in it, were far better able to obtain useful employment, and were far better oriented to the communities of which they are a part. I think the Neighborhood Youth Corps program on the whole has been one of the great successes of the poverty program.

And finally, as an eighth achievement of the poverty program, more than 42,000 Americans have received rural loans for farm improvements and small income-producing enterprises. These 42,000 Americans have in large part been able to lift themselves out of the penury and misery in which they were living with the assistance of the rural loans which have been made under the auspices of the Department of Agriculture.

I think there is a solid record of achievement in connection with the rural loans, and the committee proposes to extend that program in the pending bill.

These eight are only a few of the many specific achievements of the war on poverty. These are obvious, palpable, and measurable gains in terms of statistics, but there are many other gains that must be ascribed to this war on poverty which are less obvious and nearly impossible to measure. Among these we would have to add the goodly number of families who have been rejoined and strengthened because, through economic dignity, they have been given new hope; young people who have been diverted from delinquency, crime, and even rioting by their involvement and pride in the Neighborhood Youth Corps; high school dropouts who have been inspired to continue their education and go on to college; young parents who have kept their children instead of offering them for adoption as the result of job training that gave them new ambitions and new goals; impoverished individuals who were saved from becoming cynical and antisocial as the result of free legal services on evictions or repossession of furniture, automobile, television set, and so forth.

These are the kinds of changes in spirit and viewpoint to which President Johnson referred when he suggested that the basic conditions of life for the poor must be and can be changed.

There are 13 particular titles to the bill pending before us, and I recited them both with respect to the titles of the bill and the titles in the report—where in each instance there are findings and legislative recommendations—when I made my opening speech last Friday.

I do not intend to review each of these titles in detail, nor do I at this time intend to make a presentation in support of the emergency employment program which is title II of the act, and which is discussed with respect to findings and legislative recommendations as part 14 of the report. I think for the present this is an adequate presentation of the bill from the point of view of the commit-

tee; and in order to advise the Senator from Vermont that we are now ready for him to speak, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, at the outset, and before beginning my comments on the war on poverty in general, and on S. 2388 in particular, I want to point out an error of quotation in the supplemental views which I made in the committee report to this bill, which is designated "90th Congress, first session, Senate Report 563 on S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967."

Mr. President, on page 209 of that committee report I have included a short paragraph which I attributed to Prof. Sar A. Levitan, of the George Washington University.

Mr. President, Professor Levitan to my knowledge did not make the statement which I have attributed to him and I regret most sincerely that this error has occurred. I sincerely hope that it will result in no embarrassment to Dr. Levitan.

Those who know Dr. Levitan will know upon reading my supplemental views that the quotation is in error, for those who know him also would realize that the quotation simply is not his own.

Mr. President, I have had a long working relationship with Dr. Levitan. I know he has what I consider one of the most brilliant minds in the field of manpower and training. I have enjoyed working with him during my membership on the Senate Labor Committee and there are few persons for whom I have greater respect. I know that my colleagues share these thoughts of Dr. Levitan and his capabilities. I depend upon him very heavily, and this relationship will, I am sure, continue. The Congress itself continues to profit in large respect from the contributions which Dr. Levitan so willingly makes to it.

Mr. President, again, I regret sincerely that this error has occurred and I am going immediately to discuss the matter with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ask that this quotation which I attributed to Dr. Levitan be deleted from the permanent records of the reports of that committee.

Mr. President, I should now like to address myself to the pending bill. Once again it is time for our annual discussion of the war on poverty. Each time this measure has come to the floor, increasing numbers of controversies surrounding various programs are noted, and increasing numbers of people express doubts about the overall effectiveness of the legislation. But despite this mounting skepticism, no viable alternative programs have been suggested, or seriously considered.

I have consistently voiced doubts about the efficacy of the Economic Opportunity Act as it is presently designed. Yet, since I have agreed with and continue to support its purpose, and because I see an increasing urgency for legislation in this area, I have not and will not introduce any disabling or crippling amendments to the bill.

However, I feel that the time has come to suggest that while the Economic Opportunity Act as we know it today has raised the aspirations of millions of poor Americans, it has fallen far short of fulfilling their expectations. I suggest, therefore, that this is perhaps the last time that such a mixed collection of outdated and ineffectual programs can be expected to pass this body without innovative and creative changes. We cannot continue to rely on the shopworn cliché "well, we have tried."

Early this spring I indicated to the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty that I was going to conduct my own investigation of the war on poverty.

I would have liked to study poverty in all areas of the country. However, my staff is small and I was forced to limit the area and scope of my investigation. Therefore, I decided to concentrate on the effect of the poverty program in the District of Columbia.

I initiated my investigation, Mr. President, because I found the reports completed by OEO and the subcommittee's special investigation committee discouraging. I was appalled by their lack of objectivity, their lack of reliable statistics and their failure to utilize scientific techniques or evaluation. The community action agency reports which I have seen are both cursory and inaccurate.

My study, I hope, when it is complete, will demonstrate that reliable data can be easily obtained and clearly presented through utilization of scientific methods. I am collecting the following kinds of data: tape-recorded interviews with poverty officials and ordinary citizens, questionnaires given to poverty staff personnel and recorded on IBM cards, GAO audits, reports on the progress of neighborhood development center programs, and random sample survey information culled from interviews with inhabitants of poverty areas in the District.

This study has not yet been finished, and I anticipate that it will take some additional time to complete. As my investigation continues, I will from time to time inform the Senate of the results.

If there is anything I have learned from my investigation, it is that poverty in the United States is a complex phenomenon to which there are no simple solutions. My views on this subject are necessarily somewhat involved, and, therefore, I ask that Senators bear with me as I attempt to set before them the problem as I see it.

First of all, Mr. President, no perfect definition of poverty has yet been developed. Certainly poverty in the United States is noticeably different from poverty in a country such as India, where millions annually starve and hundreds of thousands have no home other than the streets. The fact that the poor in the

United States have comparatively more than their counterparts in the rest of the world has bothered some experts.

Reviewing this paradoxical situation, I can sympathize with Prof. John B. Parrish when he raises the following question in a recent article printed in U.S. News & World Report:

How can the "massive" group of America's "hopeless poor" buy so much with so little?

He cites the fact that almost all Americans have automatic cooking equipment, refrigeration, telephones, and some kind of medical aid as evidence that—

There is no basis in fact for the "new poverty" thesis.

But, Mr. President, as Mollie Orshansky points out in a recent article in the Social Security Bulletin—

As yesterday's luxuries become tomorrow's necessities, who can define for today how much (income) is enough?

The 1966 report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress confirms her thesis when it points out that—

It is the nature of the American experience to upgrade constantly the notion of what constitutes a decent minimum, and correspondingly, poverty.

While we may fall far short of obtaining a consensus with respect to a universal definition for poverty, it is obvious that too many Americans are faced with unnecessary want in this land of plenty.

The yardstick most commonly used to measure poverty is that of income. The U.S. Census Bureau has indicated that in 1966, there were 29.7 million people in the United States with incomes below that which is adjudged by the Social Security Administration to be necessary for freedom from want. Fourteen percent of America's 60 million families have incomes under \$3,000. This poverty affects all age groups from the young to the aged.

Poverty among the young is often hidden, but the fact that there are 4.8 million parents and children currently on the rolls for aid to dependent children is a shocking reminder of its existence. In addition to those on AFDC, President Johnson has indicated that there are perhaps "12 million children in families below the poverty level—\$3,000," who do not receive welfare benefits.

Poverty often does irreparable damage to the young poor. This is readily apparent when we consider that in 1966 more than 1 in 3 of the poor children, ages 16 to 21, were not in school and were not high school graduates, as compared with only 1 in 7 from nonpoor families. These facts are particularly significant since without education an individual is severely disadvantaged in the job market. Such a disadvantage in the job market subjects the individual to low earnings and causes a lifetime of poverty.

Among adults, growing relief rolls and high unemployment rates are testimony to the fact that many individuals do not have marketable job skills. During 1966, 2.5 million were unemployed 15 weeks or more. Of these, 1.25 million looked for jobs but could not find them. Another

1.3 million males between the age of 25 to 64 did not even look for work either because of indifference or lack of hope in finding one.

For these adults poverty has too often become a way of life. Their lack of formal education or job training gives them little chance for escaping their plight even in their old age.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to be able to say that the poverty cycle is broken at retirement, but I cannot. As a matter of fact, quite the opposite situation is true. Many individuals who had been fully self-sufficient during their working years for the first time are thrown into poverty when they retire. Thousands of these individuals are rudely awakened to the fact that their retirement income will probably equal less than one-third of the income they were used to receiving during their productive years.

At this very minute, more than 5½ million Americans over age 65 have total annual incomes below the paltry poverty level of \$1,500 a year for an individual or \$1,900 for a couple. For many of these older Americans, this standard is certainly grossly inadequate. It is grossly inadequate because living costs for the widow or widower increase; it is grossly inadequate because the infirmities of age often necessitate additional services; it is grossly inadequate because inflation continues to stretch their fixed incomes beyond the breaking point.

Americans over the age of 65 constitute the largest single group trapped by poverty. Thousands are having their first encounter with want since the depression years of the 1930's. Their encounter is with a poverty which is the cruelest of all. It is the cruelest, Mr. President, because it is attacking human beings who are least able to defend themselves from its terrible consequences. The older American has several disadvantages. Physically and psychologically he is severely handicapped in compensating for low income, poor housing, and inadequate nutrition. In addition to these limitations affecting the individual himself, society imposes discrimination, impatience, and an almost callous disrespect for the aged.

Mr. President, while dividing the population by age groups presents one way of looking at poverty, other divisions are also significant; for example, poverty is not confined to the big cities alone. During the hearings the subcommittee conducted, it was graphically demonstrated that the rural poor are probably those who are most seriously affected by poverty. Poverty is very real to those suffering from malnutrition in Mississippi, in large sections of Appalachia, and even in my own State of Vermont. Poverty has robbed thousands of adequate education, job training, and dignified retirement.

It is often alleged that rural areas receive more than their fair share of poverty money and programs. This allegation, Mr. President, is without foundation. As Sargent Shriver indicated in a letter to Senator JAVITS on March 11 of this year, the Office of Economic Opportunity had spent only about 30 percent of its funds in rural areas even though the rural areas have about 45 percent of the poor population.

Sargent Shriver himself admitted:

We have not been able to get enough programs active in the rural areas.

In many rural areas of the country we find that there are almost no social service agencies, visiting nurse services, homemaker services, senior citizen centers, public transportation, or adequate medical facilities.

So that I will not be misunderstood, Mr. President, let me emphasize that I am not opposed to fighting an efficient war on poverty in the cities. However, I believe that each one of us must not forget that the poor family in the country has as serious a problem in existing as the poor family in the city.

Obviously, Mr. President, urban problems represent the greatest threat to domestic tranquility since the depression years of the 1930's. While urban difficulties are highly complex, it is generally agreed that poverty is one of the major urban problems. The presence of poverty in urban areas is often compounded by large nonwhite populations.

Utilizing the yardstick of income alone, the nonwhite American does far worse than his white counterpart. The median income of white Americans was \$7,722 in 1966 and was only \$3,971 for nonwhites. In addition some 30.4 percent of nonwhites reported incomes of less than \$3,000 while 12.4 percent of whites were in a comparable situation. The rift between the two groups is widening as the differential risk of poverty among the groups changes. While increasing numbers of white persons have been able to lift themselves out of poverty, the incidence of poverty among nonwhites has increased. For example, of nonwhite families with as many as five children, 71 percent were categorized as poor in 1959; 76 percent in 1964.

Up to this point I have talked about the characteristics of poverty. We have seen that poverty knows no age barrier—it affects those who are young; those in their working years; those in their retirement years. We have seen that poverty has no geographic barrier—it affects those in the city and those in the country. We have seen that poverty has no racial barrier—it affects the Negro and the white.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to discuss some of the factors which contribute to poverty. Without an understanding of these causes there can be no lasting solutions.

Inferior education, ineffective job training, inadequate social security payments, substandard housing, welfare doles, urbanization, and suburbanization all contribute, both separately and together, to the continuation of poverty. Although it is difficult to isolate the effects of individual causes, I would now like to attempt to discuss each of these major areas briefly.

First, Mr. President, as a Nation we have consistently recognized the importance of education to individual and national well being. We have justifiably taken pride in our public schools being open to all children and our compulsory school laws which require the youth of our land to avail themselves of this opportunity.

While our commitment to education is

complete, our efforts are not effectively reaching those who should gain the most from it—the disadvantaged poor. Probably the most universal measurement of education achievement of our youth is the selective service mental examinations. A surprisingly large number of individuals score low marks or fail this relatively simple test. Caryl Cornor and Richard deNewville in an article entitled "How Good Are Our Schools" point out:

The 1963 Department of Labor study reported that the majority of young men failing the AFQT, White and Negro alike, were the products of poverty. Forty percent of them had never gone beyond grammar school, four out of five didn't finish high school, one-third came from broken homes, and one-fifth came from families that have needed public assistance.

The statistics are legion, Mr. President, which prove that children from poor families do not go as far in school as their middle and upper class counterparts, nor do they achieve as much while they are there. Ironically, we find ourselves in the position of telling the poor that education is the vehicle by which they can escape poverty. Yet, our school system fails particularly with children from poor families. It is imperative that we overcome this failure.

The English historian H. G. Welles characterized the dilemma we face when he said:

Man's existence is a race between education and catastrophe.

If we do not succeed in providing the poor with an adequate education, their "catastrophe" will be a lifetime of poverty due to lack of the skills necessary for successful competition in the job market.

It is essential that the Economic Opportunity Act and other Federal education programs find ways to provide adequate education for the poor children of the Nation.

Second, Mr. President, we find that large numbers of Americans do not have training adequate enough for competition in our fast moving job market. Sar A. Levitan and Garth I. Mangum, in a recent article entitled "Programs and Priorities," estimated that most of the 2.5 million periodically unemployed, 1.25 million who looked for but did not find work, and 1.3 million who did not seek work are all "potential candidates for manpower and poverty programs." The article indicated that the total enrollment in programs attempting to reach these people was 290,000. Clearly, we must provide these people with an opportunity to overcome their skill deficiency.

Unfortunately, we in Congress accepted the challenge of job training with such overzealousness that we produced a hodge-podge of legislation with much duplication and overlap in programs.

The Federal Government alone administers 79 separate training and education programs under the auspices of 15 different bureaus and agencies. The W. E. Upjohn Institute reports that funds for job recruitment can be obtained from nine manpower sources; funds for adult basic education from 10; funds for prevocational training and skill training from 10, and funds for

work experience from five. On-the-job training can be subsidized by five programs and supportive services can be funded from nine programs.

Yet, ironically, Mr. President, the multitude of programs available meet only a small part of the Nation's training and vocational education needs. The adverse effects of diffused responsibility are self-evident. For one thing, familiarity with all available resources of training and educational assistance is almost impossible for both those who need the aid and those who administer the program. For another, it has led to so much proliferation that it is now an established fact that many of these programs actually compete for and assist the same needy clientele. The inevitable result is the wastage of hundreds of thousands of dollars and incalculable time and effort. Training and vocational education programs must, of necessity, be improved, expanded, better coordinated and used more prudently.

In addition, there has been less than a complete commitment to job training by private enterprise. I believe this is understandable, Mr. President, when we consider that few businesses, large or small, can afford the time and effort necessary to seek out and negotiate with all the Federal and State purveyors of job training programs.

Another limitation to our piecemeal approach in the job training field has been that too often the really disadvantaged poor are bypassed. I suppose this is understandable, since it is human nature for a program administrator or an independent businessman to want only the "creme of the crop" when it comes to job training. Nevertheless, there can be no hope for self-sufficiency for the poor unless and until they receive adequate training for available jobs.

Third, Mr. President, reliance on an inadequate social security system by millions of Americans has significantly contributed to poverty.

(At this point Mr. MORSE assumed the chair.)

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, my belief that there is an overreliance on the adequacy of the social security benefits can be amply supported by statistics. Less than 15 percent of the nearly 20 million Americans who are now retired are covered by private pension systems. As I pointed out earlier, the vast majority of those retired rely on social security benefits as their major source of income. With such a reliance, more than 5½ million older Americans continue to live in abject poverty.

Fourth, Mr. President, poverty is both bred and nourished by substandard housing.

The most striking and noticeable visual feature of poverty in our Nation's cities is that of dirty, dilapidated, closely packed tenement buildings, whose windows and doors overflow with poorly dressed, predominantly Negro people, and whose fronts and alleys are littered with refuse and trash. Inside, if one can maneuver past the garbage which blocks the entrance and fight down the nausea which rises because of the stench, one sees falling plaster, leaking pipes, de-

fective lighting, and many other features too numerous to enumerate.

Rural squalor is less visible, but just as real. Millions of Americans dwell in tarpaper shacks of plywood shelters tucked away in Appalachia. The numbers of people who live in these conditions is appalling.

The 1960 census classified 10.6 million of the 58.3 million housing units in the country, substandard by virtue of either structural deficiencies or lack of plumbing. Of these 10.6 million substandard units, 4.3 million were located in urban places, 4.8 million in rural non-farm communities, and 1.5 million on rural farms.

These statistics become even more appalling when one considers that generally the number of individuals per housing unit is greater in bad housing than in good housing.

Many experts in the field argue that probably over 30 percent of American families are living in substandard homes. The inadequacies of housing are particularly evident in our Nation's Capital. During our subcommittee hearings, Mr. President, we learned that over 41 percent of the people in Washington, D.C., are living in substandard housing.

Government efforts at eradication of substandard housing can be considered minimal, piecemeal, and ultimately harmful. The latter is true because while urban renewal concepts have raised expectations of change, the actual effect of programs put into operation has been to exacerbate already horrendous conditions.

For example, VA- and FHA-guaranteed loans have tended to move middle class families from the inner city to the suburbs. Urban renewal legislation has tended to raze large sections of inner cities, causing massive dislocation of low-income families. Public housing has encouraged continued dependency on the welfare dole by destroying self-sufficiency incentives, since severe income restrictions force inhabitants to move out after slight increases in income.

Poor housing is an integral part of poverty and cannot be isolated from it. Elimination of substandard housing can pave the way to victory over poverty. However, so long as one out of five American families live in unfit housing our war on poverty becomes a stalemate never to be won.

Fifth, Mr. President, the welfare dole all too often significantly contributes to the continuation of poverty. Poverty has been described as a vicious circle. It does seem to be self-perpetuating. For example, it has been noted from studies of welfare recipients that as many as three generations in the same family have lived entirely on the welfare program.

Certainly, it cannot be denied that there is a need for welfare payments in many instances. However, it is frightening to consider that the 8.25 million individuals now on public welfare number one million more than those on relief during the depression year of 1936.

It is frightening, Mr. President, because this Nation has the highest standard of living in the world.

It is frightening, Mr. President, be-

cause it seems that the welfare dole is becoming a matter of right rather than merely a means whereby society acts humanely.

It is frightening, Mr. President, because the welfare dole, because of its very nature, encourages dependency rather than self-sufficiency.

For those families in which welfare has become a way of life, generation after generation, the very system of welfare payments must be held at least partly responsible for the continuation of poverty.

Sixth, Mr. President, urbanization and suburbanization have been major contributing factors to poverty.

There are wide and constant population shifts in our country. The promise of the city and the hope of jobs pulled millions off the farms and into the city, particularly during the decades including and following the great depression. The shift from country to city life produced strains, caused dislocation, and disruption of traditional social patterns and undoubtedly contributed to urban poverty.

Urbanization continues today, but in a slightly different way. There are several aspects of this new type of urbanization which are relevant to the problems of poverty. First, it should be noted that Negroes who are at an economic disadvantage are now more urbanized than are whites. In 1960, according to U.S. census figures, 69.5 percent of whites were urban dwellers compared with 73.2 percent of Negroes.

A concomitant phenomenon has been the departure of the whites for the suburbs, leaving the Negro behind in the inner city. Between 1930 and 1960 the Negro proportion of the population of Washington, D.C., for example, increased from 27.1 to 53.9 percent and in 1965 became 61.4 percent. The 92,890 persons who moved from the District between 1953 and 1960 were 95 per cent white.

Those who migrate to the suburbs from both races are the middle aged population or younger middle-aged population. This means that there are increases in the numbers of very old and very young age groups, but decreasing numbers of the people in between—people who would be most likely to be capable of self-sufficiency.

Industry is moving to the suburbs with the employable people. A Bureau of Labor Statistics study reveals that from 1960 to 1965, 62 percent of valuation permits authorized for new industrial buildings and 52 percent of valuation for mercantile buildings were issued for the suburbs. A CEA report indicated that in seven large metropolitan areas 975,000 new jobs became available in the suburban ring in the period 1948-62. At the same time central cities gained only 60,000 jobs. This indicates a major redistribution of employment.

These facts—

As Secretary Wirtz has said:

reveal a long-term tendency for major sources of employment to be located quite a distance from the residence of workers with a very high incidence of unemployment and poverty.

A third aspect of the urbanization phenomenon is the push-pull mechanism which causes the very poor—particularly but not exclusively Negro—to continue to migrate to the city. Lower welfare payments, fewer job opportunities and less general economic activity tend to push residents from poorer rural States to urban areas which generally have higher welfare payments and more Federal and State job training and job-creating activities. And the increasing amount of Federal activity on the job-creating area exercises a pull on those in rural areas.

Finally, Mr. President, the isolation and alienation of the poor in the inner city are significant factors of poverty. Urban life with its overcrowding, dirt, and impersonality has a dislocating effect on the individual moving to the city from the country, and a disruptive effect on normal social patterns.

In addition, Mr. President, we have become such a complex society that a high degree of organization seems to be our hallmark. In every city in this country without exception, one can find hundreds of organizations espousing various interests. With all these organizations it would seem that every individual in the city would feel a part of the city through one or more of the interest groups. But this is not the case.

In city after city individuals have become more isolated and alienated from the rest of the city. This isolation and alienation all too often create frustration against the existing structures of society.

Formerly, there were institutions in large cities which took a special interest in the poor. However, many of these have tended to become middle class, changing status along with the immigrants they first organized and have moved to the suburbs. The day of party patronage and of the ward politician has, for the most part passed. City government has become increasingly more centralized and impersonal, and the individual in the slums is unable to relate to it in any way.

In this kind of environment, Mr. President, where the individual is often thrown out of—or never incorporated in—the family fold, where the individual finds few opportunities or incentive for advancement, and where the individual feels disassociated from institutions of all kinds, isolation, frustration, alienation, lack of motivation and withdrawal are common reactions.

Mr. President, poverty is still with us, as we have seen from our examination of characteristics and causes. And, the existing programs, indeed, the whole war on poverty has failed to break the vicious circle of poverty. I submit that the operation has failed to reach the takeoff point because the approach has been wrong.

The poverty program has for the most part consisted of solutions proposed to alleviate the specific ills of the 1930's. These are ideas and programs which are largely inappropriate to, inadequate for, and unadaptable to the complex poverty problems of the 1960's. The dedication on the part of the administration to these outdated ideas has resulted in a stale-

mated poverty war which has become itself a vicious circle of inefficiency and, in many cases, ineffectuality.

Utilization of old ideas has resulted in a hodge-podge program and piecemeal efforts. These piecemeal efforts are ineffectual, so additional panaceas are offered leading to a proliferation of programs.

The great number of programs is confusing, and often unsuccessful, so similar programs are adopted, resulting in duplication and overlap.

Because of duplication and overlap, there is lack of coordination between agencies running programs, especially with regard to funding.

Lack of coordination results in misunderstanding which leads to actual administrative in-fighting over programs.

Since each agency is jealous of its own programs, there is no effort made to effectively evaluate the programs, and cutbacks in financing or phaseouts are unheard of.

Since there is no evaluation, no cutback and no programs are terminated, there is little effort made to develop new ideas, so the old ideas and old programs of the 1930's remain.

We must be open to innovative ideas which will take into account the different complex causes and effects of poverty. We must also discontinue our piecemeal efforts, realizing that many of the problems of poverty are interrelated. Only comprehensive, integrated, coordinated efforts will enable us to make maximum headway on the poverty front.

Toward this end, I would propose that the following steps be taken toward finding solutions to poverty in the United States.

Mr. President, better education is an ultimate and long range solution to the problems of poverty. We must concentrate on developing more effective and innovative tools for motivating and training those who are economically, physically or mentally disabled. Some progress has been made in this area, but our efforts must be doubled.

I believe that the education being provided for retarded children in this country exemplifies what can be done with constructive cooperation between the Federal, State, and local governments. While we still have a long way to go in that area, we have made significant strides in educating those who were considered ineducable 10 or 15 years ago.

If through cooperation, we can make great strides forward for those who are mentally or physically disadvantaged we can also provide a better education for those who are economically and socially disadvantaged.

Some of the new education-type programs developed in the war on poverty are proving to be of considerable importance in our effort to help those who have not been helped through presently existing educational institutions.

The Headstart program for preschool children has proven very successful in helping youngsters to adjust to the school environment.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is a program which has mixed blessings. The in-school portion of NYC programs have

proven to be most beneficial because they do encourage young people to remain in school and at the same time help them acquire needed skills essential to future employment.

The out-of-school NYC programs, however, leave much to be desired for they are too often merely of a make-work nature. Exclusive of providing temporary income, out-of-school NYC seems to fall short of any real valuable training experience.

In the first years of the war on poverty, I was opposed to the Job Corps program, and have, in the past, offered amendments to remove it from the bill. It is an inordinately expensive program in relation to the results it has produced. This year, however, significant administrative and personnel changes have taken place in the Job Corps structure at OEO, and I look forward with considerable hope for the increased worth of the program as a result of these changes. The Job Corps has developed excellent techniques for educating disadvantaged youth which should be studied carefully and emulated by educational institutions which are themselves attempting to cope with large numbers of poor youths.

Mr. President, several of my amendments affecting the Job Corps were accepted in subcommittee. These, I hope, will aid the Job Corps in achieving its purpose. Among those was an amendment which provided that the final salary check of a graduating enrollee be picked up at the nearest office of the U.S. Employment Service. I believe that this will give the Employment Service an opportunity to be of service to the returning graduates. Hopefully, this will not only result in better job placement, but will also provide a means for maintaining better statistics concerning the success of Job Corps training.

Also adopted was my amendment which would provide that an enrollee's rate of pay not exceed \$35 per month during the first 6 months; but could go as high as \$65 per month thereafter. I believe that this will provide incentives for young men and women to stay in the Job Corps until they receive the fullest benefits possible.

Along the same line, my amendment providing that there should be no readjustment allowance for enrollees who do not stay in the program for at least 180 days was adopted.

Second, Mr. President, the man who is unemployed is similar to a patient with many ills. He needs the assistance of a variety of specialists to cure him. Most, of course, do not have necessary skills—they need training. Many of the unemployed, however, also suffer from health defects. Others lack the incentive to seek help; they must be sought out. Still others do not have the motivation necessary to remain on a job they have been trained for—these people need counseling and advice. Because of these factors, there is a need for the establishment of centers where services can be provided as training takes place.

Just as the services of every medical specialist in a hospital must be available

to a patient with multiple ills, so every segment of the community must cooperate in providing both training and services. There must, in addition, be Federal and local cooperation in improving the environmental conditions of the city so that the efforts of the newly trained individual to actually secure employment will be facilitated. In this regard, better interurban transportation, the establishment of more day care centers, and the adjustment of employment criteria are important areas in which action and improvements are needed.

What is being done to improve the present piecemeal approach? Not nearly enough. Instead, Mr. President, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has seen fit to recommend a new emergency Employment Act which will not provide training or supportive services, but will spend an inordinate amount of money on make-work jobs. This approach is reminiscent of the WPA projects of the thirties. It is not a long-range solution to the problems of unemployment.

In addition, there is a great danger inherent in the title II program. Such a job program could actually exacerbate the problems of our cities by attracting a multitude of rural poor to the cities. Eli Ginzburg, in an article entitled "Advice to the Urban Coalition," printed in the Reporter, mentions the following problems which could plague a massive Federal job program:

What of the substantial numbers of poor whites and poor Negroes who, despite the massive cityward migration of the last two decades, still live on farms or in rural non-farm locations. We must expect them, too, to drift into the cities and attempt to get jobs on the Federal work program.

The truth is that it will not be possible to design a work program satisfactory to the disadvantaged of the slums without also creating a magnetic pull on many other poorly paid workers in the urban and rural economy, a pull so powerful that the Federal government would not be able to cope with the numbers seeking jobs on the new program.

Even this vast make-work project, however, will not provide all the people who need jobs with employment. There should be some system of priorities in any program so that those most needing assistance can receive it. The heads of families, for example, since they have dependent children, should be given first consideration.

Mr. President, until now, the most important and most successful of our training programs have been those which provide on-the-job training and those projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Their results have been valuable because they have permitted the poor to make advances which they otherwise would have not made. It is well for us to remember, however, that MDTA and OJT have been significantly more successful than other programs because those who have been selected as participants have possessed the greatest potential for achievement.

Government programs cannot hope to take care of training the vast number of those who need it, however. Thus, the participation of private industry must be sought.

During the past two Congresses, I have offered what has become known as the Human Investment Act, which would provide tax credits to businesses and industries which conduct training programs to assist in developing the skills among the unemployed and upgrading those of the employed and underemployed. This approach to training increase the worth of the poor of the Nation, and permits them to become gainfully employed without the stigma which inevitably will attach to any make-work program.

What is more important, Mr. President, the human investment approach provides the incentive which we must have if we are to overcome the great reluctance which business has to hire and train middle-aged persons. I am well aware that there are programs going on in American industry today in which older persons and others are being trained in order to fill empty jobs which now are going begging. But I am convinced that industry, and indeed our entire commercial structure, can and will expand this type of training very substantially if provided with meaningful inducements.

I submit that the human investment approach might very well be the answer to many of the training problems encountered in the war on poverty.

Third, Mr. President, I would like to propose a solution for eliminating poverty among our older citizens.

For the vast majority of Americans who have reached age 65, job training, additional education or Federal programs providing work relief have little application. But, Mr. President, we in Congress have the ability to eliminate the plight of the older American by providing adequate social security benefits. For the last few years, I have proposed that we increase the minimum social security benefits from \$44 per month to at least \$70 per month. Unlike last year, the administration joined in proposing this goal for this session of Congress. I am hopeful that when the social security bill reaches the Senate floor, we will be able to increase the \$50 minimum contained in the bill which passed the House and increase it to at least \$70.

I realize, Mr. President, that even \$70 per month will not completely eliminate poverty for the 5½ million older Americans who desperately need more income. However, Commissioner Ball, of the Social Security Administration, testified before the Finance Committee that such an increase would have the effect of lifting 2 million Americans out of poverty. There are few times that Congress has been offered such a certain opportunity for eliminating a large segment of poverty.

Another part of the social security law which should be amended in order to eliminate poverty among the aged is the so-called retirement test or earnings limitation. At present, a social security recipient is, in effect, penalized whenever he earns more than \$1,500 a year. I have proposed raising that retirement test or earnings limitation to \$2,400 a year, for two reasons:

First, I believe that a significant number of older Americans are quite ready,

willing, and able to supplement their income by their own efforts.

Second, I believe that for many older Americans employment contributed not only to the productivity of the Nation, but also fulfills their physical and psychological needs.

In this area, Mr. President, we do not need piece-meal legislation; we do not need gimmicks; we do not need a proliferation of programs. What we do need, Mr. President, is to provide adequate social security benefits.

Fourth, Mr. President, I would like to propose that the time has come for a more realistic approach to the problem of substandard housing.

Our greatest efforts have been in the area of urban renewal. However, as Congressman WILLIAM WIDNALL noted in testimony before the Ribicoff hearings on urban affairs, urban renewal has not been a success. He said:

Urban renewal started in 1949, and here it is 1966, and we haven't taken any kind of look at what has been accomplished by it, whether or not taxes have improved because of it. We do know that in city after city throughout this country, buildings have been bulldozed, just knocked down, and the land has been left fallow for years, with a loss of any revenue ratables at all. I can cite you one city after another where this has happened.

Mr. President, the time has come for some creative thinking in the housing field. Certainly public housing with its income limitations and welfare approach does not encourage self-sufficiency for its beneficiary.

It was with that thought in mind that I was pleased to cosponsor S. 1592 which was introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY]. That bill, if enacted, would establish a national homeowners foundation which would provide a constructive partnership between the public and private sectors of our economy.

More importantly, Mr. President, it would provide homeownership for thousands of American families who could otherwise not afford it. I am convinced that the principle of homeownership has distinct benefits over any system based on welfare alone.

Fifth, Mr. President, I propose that we study how this Nation can decrease the size of its welfare rolls.

I believe that it is appalling that today we have 1 million more recipients on the welfare rolls than in the depression year of 1936. I would hope that serious consideration be given to proposals which encourage able-bodied individuals in receipt of welfare to participate in work-training programs.

As you know, title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provided for work experience programs specifically designed to remove heads of households from the welfare rolls. Unfortunately, my investigations of the title V project in Newark, N.J., and elsewhere convinced me that poor administration and an overemphasis on the work relief approach seriously impaired the effectiveness of title V.

As with other parts of the poverty program, I believe constant scrutiny and

evaluation are necessary so as to insure that we get the most for our money.

Sixth, Mr. President, we must develop an overall approach which will minimize the detrimental effects of urbanization and suburbanization.

Basically, Mr. President, what is required is that people and job opportunities be brought together. There must be adequate mobility so that people can travel to and from work. There must be incentives for industry to provide jobs in areas where they are needed.

It was with these thoughts in mind, Mr. President, that I cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 64, introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. That resolution, Mr. President, will establish a commission for a balanced economy which would look into the possibility for locating industry in rural areas. Perhaps we will find that the time has come to conduct economic planning in partnership with business so as to minimize the migration of citizens from one jobless area to another.

Finally, Mr. President, some method must be devised for enabling the isolated, alienated individual who lives in the inner city to act in concert with his fellow slum dwellers to improve his conditions, communicate his feelings to government, and to institute change.

The recent urban upheaval we have had should be proof to all of us that there is a need for new and constructive thinking with respect to urban living. When we consider the problems of poverty, we often forget that part of the problem is political rather than economic, and stems from the isolation, alienation, and frustration of the urban dweller. Milton Kotler, of the Institute for Policy Research, has perhaps stated the problem most eloquently. He says:

The greatest current defect of city government is the vast distance which exists between its administration and its citizens. The process of city administration is invisible to the citizen who sees little evidence of its human components but feels the sharp pain of taxation. With increasingly poor public service, his desires and needs are more insistently expressed. Yet his expressions of needs seem to issue into thin air, for government does not appear attentive to his demands. This disjunction between citizen and government is the major political problem of city government because it embodies the dynamics of civil disorder.

Community action agencies and neighborhood development centers have, for the most part, not succeeded in either involving individuals in the neighborhood or enabling them to relate their feelings to government. For this reason, I have viewed with extreme interest the concept and the possibilities of the neighborhood corporation.

A neighborhood corporation, as I understand it, is in effect a city within a city, organization based on a territorial unit which enables an individual through his natural group structure to relate to government. Such an approach is most attractive. As I understand it, a neighborhood corporation could, upon demonstration of its responsibility, gradually be given more and more authority.

Coming as I do from Vermont, where the town meeting provides a political outlet for all citizens, and makes it difficult for any Vermonter to feel isolated or alienated, I am interested in any concept which will encourage participatory democracy.

The distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has introduced S. 143, which would provide incentives for the formation of neighborhood corporations. I would hope that the Senate would carefully consider this concept of the neighborhood corporation which has been demonstrated effective in at least one instance.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to say that we have reached a point where the war on poverty must be reevaluated. Promises are plentiful, but meaningful results have fallen far short of expectations.

We must recognize, Mr. President that piecemeal proposals left over from the 1930's are not adequate to meet the needs of the 1960's.

I have offered some viable alternatives to the antiquated approach represented in this act. It is all too apparent to individuals in this body and to the country at large that creative measures such as the Human Investment Act, the Commission for Studying a Balanced Economy, the National Homeowners' Foundation, increased benefits for older Americans, and other imaginative proposals must be given a greater priority.

We must try to keep the young in school by providing adequate education which prepares them for entry into the Nation's work force. We must insure that all able bodied Americans who form a part of the working force have the skills, training, motivation, and opportunity necessary for securing and keeping employment in a job which will provide sufficient income for existence above the threshold of poverty. We must provide adequate income for those who are partially or completely out of the work force because of age. Finally, for those who are physically or mentally handicapped or who for other reasons are untrainable, the Government, I am afraid, must act as employer of last resort.

But, Mr. President, the Federal Government cannot do the job of eliminating poverty all by itself. There must be a coordinated and comprehensive effort by the Federal, State, and local governments and above all both the private sector of the economy and organized labor must become fully involved.

Working together, avoiding excessive duplication and avoiding the piecemeal approach of programs from the 1930's, we can win the war on poverty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The Chair suggests the absence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, earlier today, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey severely criticized the President of the United States for an alleged vacuum of leadership in dealing with the problems of the cities. Among other things, he used this language:

There are times in the life of every man, and every nation, that demand the courage of conviction. I find it difficult to discern either courage or conviction in the actions of the Administration to date. The banner is raised, at least intermittently, but there is no drive behind it. The Administration marches backward.

Mr. President, the legislation which is pending before us is of great concern to all of us—to the Senators from New Jersey, the Senators from Maine, and the Senators from all 50 States. The record shows that it is a problem of concern to the President of the United States. I think the record will show further, Mr. President, that no President in our history has shown more concern, forwarded more recommendations, or fought harder for programs dealing with the problems of the cities, than has President Johnson.

Understandably, among those who are concerned there will be differences of opinion as to specifically what programs should be enacted, what programs should be supported, or what programs should be pushed, and at what time. But to disagree as to these details, Mr. President, is something different from questioning each other's motives or each other's sincerity. I submit, Mr. President, that it does not serve the cause of the cities, the cause that so many of us seek to serve, to destroy the credibility of one who has been one of the best friends that the cities have had in the history of our country.

The record of the 89th Congress, Mr. President, is replete with new, imaginative, and meaningful programs dealing with the problems of urban America which were submitted to us by the administration. The 89th Congress enacted scores of programs having an impact upon the lives of the citizens in our cities. The number of grant-in-aid programs, for example, has increased from slightly more than 70 in 1960 to well over 200 at the present time; and most of those programs deal, in one way or another, with the problems of the crowded masses of people in our cities.

The Senator from New Jersey has criticized the President for the inadequacy of his programs. Let me say, on that point, that the President must deal with the political realities which confront him, as much as must the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

(Mr. CLARK assumed the chair as Presiding Officer at this point.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I rise to support the Senator from Maine, because I think there is not the slightest basis in fact for criticizing the President of the United States in respect to the position he has taken in trying to help the cities, and particularly to help solve our ghetto problems. I think history will record that

the President of the United States has exercised remarkable leadership in trying to awaken the American people to the nature of this very serious domestic problem.

As the Senator from Maine knows, I have worked very closely with the President ever since he has been in office, and with President Kennedy before him, in connection with our whole educational program. If Senators will just take a look at the record President Johnson has made in proposing legislation and supporting those of us who have handled his legislation in connection with Federal aid to education for special educational programs within the cities, they will have all the rebuttal they need to meet any partisan attack on the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I feel that I have some little right, as well as a duty, to express my support of the President, in view of the fact that when I find myself in disagreement with him, as in the field of foreign policy, I do not hesitate to express my disagreement.

I wish to say that this President is a great President, and I want particularly to stress the fact that his greatness is illustrated time and time again by the positions he has taken in connection with our city problems. He has again, as I have worked with him this year on our educational programs, recognized the importance of our doing something about the problems of education in the ghettos and the metropolitan areas of the country. I shall not take further time to state the documentation I can state in support of that position, but let me mention one very quickly: The leadership of the President in connection with the Job Corps training program, which seeks to get down to the slum areas and take out of them the school dropouts which, if we do not do something for them, will drastically increase the populations of the prisons of this country.

What the President seeks to do is to have them increase the number of men and women in jobs. For, when we do that, we give them the economic wherewithal with which they can develop their citizen responsibility.

I am therefore pleased to have this opportunity to say these few words in support of the position the Senator from Maine has taken.

The support he has given the President with respect to this issue is richly deserved.

(At this point, Mr. MORSE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for giving me this support. He can speak first hand on this subject, especially in the field of labor and education legislation. I am delighted to have him help fill out the record.

Mr. President, I was speaking of the political reality which the President has had to face and which the Senator from New Jersey must face. For example, last year the President sent up his recommendation for the model cities program. He asked for \$2.3 billion to be spent over 6 years.

In committee, where I was privileged to handle the legislation, in order to get

the bill out of committee I had to agree to a reduction of that program from \$2.3 billion to \$900 million for a 2-year period.

We brought that bill to the floor of the Senate. I point out to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey that a majority of his party on this floor voted against a bill which represented a sharp reduction from what the President had requested.

What has happened this year? This year the President asked for full funding of the model cities program in the amount of \$662 million. What happened to that request? The House cut it to \$237 million. And how did the Members of the House from the political party of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey vote? One hundred and forty-one Republicans in the House voted against the measure, or voted for the cut.

I do not use these figures to question the honesty of the support which the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey gives to these programs. I use these figures to point out that, just as he must face the political reality, so must the President.

With respect to the pending legislation, the poverty program, has the Senator from New Jersey forgotten that it was this President who created the war on poverty? I can recall vividly when he sent that recommendation up to us shortly after he became President, the cries of ridicule and political expediency with which it was greeted by Members on the Republican side of the aisle.

The President fought to get that program created. He has fought to keep it alive ever since. And it is interesting to note the reaction of another member of the political party of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey to the President's leadership in this respect.

I will read from this morning's issue of the New York Times, a statement of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, made on the program "Issues and Answers."

Mr. Rockefeller, when questioned whether President Johnson had failed to recognize the racial problem, said:

To the contrary, I personally think he, as much as anyone, has anticipated the situation, and his poverty program will go down in history as one of the truly significant programs.

This is not Senator MUSKIE speaking. This is not President Johnson speaking. This is the Governor of the State of New York, a member of the political party of the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey, speaking.

Returning to the subject of political realities, the President sent up a request this year for funding of the rent supplement program, and on the House side it was completely eliminated from the bill—163 Republicans voted against it; 12 Republicans voted for it.

Mr. President, in his speech the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey used this language:

The banner is raised, at least intermittently, but there is no drive behind it.

Mr. President, I would like to refer to some copies of correspondence which indicate that the President not only sends

up these recommendations and appropriation requests, but also works unceasingly day in and day out behind the scenes to rally congressional support for the programs.

One would think that in these days when he is beleaguered by our overseas problems that he might let up, and that he might be forgiven for letting up, on these domestic programs. However, in August of this year—and I have copies—three letters were sent by the President to the appropriate leaders on the Hill pleading for their support for programs of the cities.

On August 23, 1967, he wrote to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in which letter he said:

I am glad I had an opportunity to speak to you Friday about the critical importance of obtaining favorable and prompt legislative action on the problems of our cities.

We are all very much encouraged by your support for the Rent Supplement Program and I wanted you to have copies of letters I have sent to Senators Mansfield and Magnuson. I hope you will study them and give your support to these programs which are so important to all of our cities some of the most important of which you so eloquently speak for.

On the same date, he wrote to the Vice President, and in the opening paragraph of that letter, he said:

As we discussed at breakfast this morning, it is of critical importance that the programs for the cities now pending before the Congress be enacted with the funding we have requested.

On the same date, the President wrote to the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who so ably handled the independent offices appropriations bill last week, and the President said in the opening paragraph:

I am writing to you about three vital requests now pending before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriation: the rent supplements program, the Model Cities program, and a program of urban research and technology. These three new, far-reaching and innovative measures are, I believe, among the most important measures of this decade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the three letters be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1967.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HUBERT: As we discussed at breakfast this morning, it is of critical importance that the programs for the cities now pending before the Congress be enacted with the funding we have requested.

As you know, both you and I have met over the past several months with hundreds of Governors, Mayors and urban specialists and we have attempted to enlist their support in the major effort that must be mounted at every level to attack successfully the problem of the cities.

The most critical point of our attack at this time must be directed at enacting the programs carefully and thoroughly planned and thought out by our Task Forces and Special Commission Groups, the Bureau of

the Budget and Cabinet Officers involved. As you are well aware from our many meetings and discussions of this subject, this is the legislation outlined in the letter I wrote to Senator Mansfield and the enclosed letter which I have sent to Senator Magnuson.

I want you to intensify your efforts in this area with the Cabinet and work closely with my staff in obtaining prompt consideration and action on this legislation.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., August 23, 1967.

Hon. EVERETT DIRKSEN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: I am glad I had an opportunity to speak to you Friday about the critical importance of obtaining favorable and prompt legislative action on the problems of our cities.

We are all very much encouraged by your support for the Rent Supplement Program and I wanted you to have copies of letters I have sent to Senators Mansfield and Magnuson. I hope you will study them and give your support to these programs which are so important to all of our cities some of the most important of which you so eloquently speak for.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AUGUST 19, 1967.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you about three vital requests now pending before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriation: the rent supplements program, the Model Cities program, and a program of urban research and technology. These three new, far-reaching and innovative measures are, I believe, among the most important measures of this decade.

As the subcommittee begins its deliberations, I hope you will consider several facts about these measures:

They embody the best thoughts, the newest ideas, and the wisest advice of the Nation's most eminent specialists on city problems.

They are programs which have enormous potential for our cities.

They are programs to stimulate local initiative and private investment, which are essential to effective action in the cities.

THE RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM

The most striking feature of the rent supplement program, I believe, is its "multiplier effect"—the power of a few million Federal dollars to call up many millions in private capital.

The \$40 million I am requesting for this fiscal year will generate an estimated \$500 million in private construction—to plan and build more than 40,000 homes and apartments for poor families.

In the twelve months after I signed the first measure providing funds for the rent supplement program, commitments were made to assist more than 34,000 housing units.

At a time when inadequate and dilapidated housing afflicts so many neighborhoods, we dare not lose the momentum which we have already gained. This year, however, the House eliminated all funds I sought for continuing the program.

I believe that this was a step backward—a serious blow at a time when interest in the program was high. When the House acted, Secretary Weaver was preparing to move forward on new applications for this fiscal year. The House action jeopardized that forward movement.

More than any other low-income housing program, this new initiative brings into play the resources and the energy of private enterprise. For it is private developers who build and operate housing projects under this program—and who receive the incentive which rent supplements provide. I believe we can well afford to pursue this creative idea. It will bring new vitality not only to our neighborhoods, but to all private efforts in housing and community development.

THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

Nothing shames this modern nation more than squalor in the cities. But it would be unwise to suggest that mere dollars alone can cure that squalor. What is needed most critically is a concentration of manpower, imagination, and local initiative—bolstered by public funds.

The Model Cities program provides exactly such a focussing of talent, planning and money. It is the cement which holds together the plans, efforts and programs to build a decent life in the cities. Perhaps more than any other program, Model Cities promises a new charter for American cities.

In 1966, I asked the Congress to approve this program at \$2.3 billion over six years. Congress authorized \$900 million over two years. This year, we have asked for full funding under that authorization—\$400 million, together with \$250 million for special urban renewal projects and an additional \$12 million in Model Cities planning funds, or a total of \$662 million. This \$662 million is the minimum that Congress should consider. Last month, however, the House reduced this figure by two-thirds—to a total of only \$237 million.

I believe that action was a serious setback for the approximately 200 cities, including most of the largest ones in the Nation, which have already applied for model cities funds. I think we owe those 200 cities and their citizens the hope and progress which the Model Cities program, adequately funded, can provide.

Like the rent supplement program, this approach is innovative. It is precisely aimed at the most critical urban problems—and it is prudent. Like the rent supplement program, it features a striking economic-multiplier effect.

Every dollar of Model Cities funds, for example, has the potential to attract ten additional dollars—in local public funds, in private investment, and in other federal funds. The \$400 million I am requesting can generate as much as \$4 Billion in other funds, private, city and state joining in.

When considered in terms of its direct cost to the taxpayers, the Model Cities Act is a modest program. But when seen in terms of its potential to generate new dollars and new efforts—this program has vast power to transform our cities.

I urge you to bring to the attention of each member of the Committee these facts—and to restore funds for this program to the full \$662 million I requested in January. Eight months have already passed since the request and the need is urgent and the cities need a go-ahead signal now.

URBAN RESEARCH

We need the tools which these two programs offer for city building and city planning. But we must also advance in another vital field: urban research and technology.

Since World War II, we have seen truly revolutionary technological advances—in space, in defense, in health and medicine. But in meeting city problems, we too often rely upon the same techniques which sufficed decades ago.

If we are to provide the new housing and new knowledge which our Nation urgently needs, we must develop new and faster and more efficient housing techniques. If we are to improve the cities, we need to learn more

about the life of cities and their people. The key to that knowledge is intensified research.

I therefore urge that the Committee approve the full \$20 million which I requested in my budget for research in urban technology, which the House recently reduced to \$5 million.

Today, as never before, those of us in position of national leadership face historic choices. And today, as never before, it is the city which occupies the center of our concern. I hope that you and the other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and all Senators, will act—and act promptly—in the light of our historic opportunity and obligation to improve the life of America's city dwellers.

Sincerely,

L. B. J.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose this afternoon to attack the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. I understand that this is a very political year and that we are on the threshold of another year which will be even more political. The newspapers are full of the alleged problems of the President in the political field. So, understandably, it must be a temptation to those on the other side of the political aisle to take a potshot at the program.

But the problem we are discussing, the problem of the cities, is perhaps the most critical domestic issue with which this country has been confronted since the Civil War, if not since the founding of the Republic. If we are to solve it, we must mobilize all of the support, all of the friends, all of the ideas, all of the imagination, all of the courage which is available from any source and apply to them the greatest wisdom of which we are capable. It does not serve that cause to undertake to destroy the credibility of the best friend the cities have ever had in the White House.

The President has sent to Congress more and more innovated programs dealing with these problems than has any other occupant of the White House. I fully understand that there are those in this body who think that we ought to do more at this particular time than the President has recommended. I happen to think that we ought to be doing more in supporting the program to clean up our waters than the President has recommended this year; but because he and I disagree as to the amounts we should make available this year does not make him less a friend of clean waters, less a friend of conservation. His dedication, his interest, and his concern fully match mine in that respect, and I would not for a moment, when I express disagreement with him on the dollar amount we should spend this year, question his motivation.

I am suggesting that we should use the same standard with respect to the problems of the cities.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is the principal author of title II of the bill pending before the Senate, to create jobs in the cities. I have great sympathy for that title and may vote for it. But the fact that the President has not given that title his support does not take away his credentials as a man dedicated to the problems of the cities.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I completely agree with what the Senator from Maine has just said. The President has a very different problem than we do in the Senate. He has the fiscal problem, the budgetary problem. He has on his shoulders the entire responsibility, in large part, of the war in Vietnam.

We in the Senate try to do what we believe is right for our constituents, within the level of our legislative competence and our legislative experience. The fact that the committee has reported this emergency employment bill is not a reflection in any way on the President of the United States.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to have that comment for the RECORD from the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

In addition, I wish to make the point I was about to make, that in order to get maximum support for that concept over the long run—and, hopefully, the short run—the sound tactic is not to divide the friends of the cities but to unite them.

The President supports title I. He created the basic program which title I seeks to advance further.

I do not see that we are serving any useful purpose by undertaking to criticize the President's motives or his effort or his courage or his convictions. If ever leadership has moved into this field, it moved in the person of President Lyndon B. Johnson. I believe history will give him full credit for that effort, as Governor Rockefeller has suggested. Whatever else happens in his Presidency, whatever has happened in his Presidency, I am sure that the President himself will count as one of his great services to this country the effort he has made to awaken America to the dangers which abound in urban America.

At the turn of this century, my hometown celebrated an anniversary. The principal speaker on that occasion was the president of Brown University. One of the remarks he made which I believe will live for a long time up there, is that Americans have succeeded nobly in founding States, but they have not yet learned to govern cities. This was true in 1900. It is still true in 1967.

President Johnson did not create the problem in 1900, but he is the first President since that time to fully respond to the challenge and to give us programs so sweeping and so broad that Congress itself has not yet given the full support he has requested.

At such time as Congress surpasses the President's recommendations, then perhaps we can stand on the floor of the Senate and say that the President has not done as much as he should have. But at this point no Member of Congress can say that about the President, and there is still a full agenda of possible action in the field of urban problems with which Congress must work.

On August 16 of this year, the President sent to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], a list of the programs dealing with urban problems upon which Congress has not yet acted.

So I suggest, Mr. President, that we address ourselves to this agenda. When

we have completed action on it, then let us measure what we have done against what the President has requested, and judge each other accordingly. I doubt that the President will come out second best when that evaluation has been made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the President to Senator MANSFIELD be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER ON THE AMERICAN CITY FROM THE PRESIDENT TO SENATE MAJORITY LEADER MIKE MANSFIELD

DEAR MIKE: It has long been apparent that the health of our nation can be no better than the health of our cities.

Surely not a single American can doubt this any longer, after the tragic events of this summer.

Just two months after I became President—in January 1964—I sent to the Congress a Special Message on Housing and Community Development. In outlining a series of new proposals for the cities of America, I said: "Whether we achieve our goal of a decent home in a decent neighborhood for every American citizen rests, in large measure, on the action we take now."

Shortly thereafter, I called together some of the most brilliant minds, the most talented planners, and the most experienced urban experts in the nation. After exhaustive study, they recommended to me a number of proposals that hold vast promise for the future of every city in this nation. Chief among these proposals was the Model Cities Program—the most coordinated, massive and far-reaching attack on urban blight ever proposed to the Congress. This was not just a federal program. It was designed to stimulate local initiative in the private sector, and at the state, county and local level.

I asked Congress to authorize \$2.3 billion for the first six years of this program. Congress reduced that request to \$900 million for 2 years.

This year, I requested full funding of the Model Cities—\$662 million. The House has already cut that request to \$237 million.

I urge that this request be restored in full. We can no longer be satisfied with "business as usual" when the problems are so urgent.

These problems demand the best that an enlightened nation can plan, and the most that an affluent nation can afford.

In addition, the Congress now has before it a number of other programs proposed by the Administration which are concerned entirely or significantly with the urban problems of our nation. These programs, taken together, represent an all-out commitment to the safety and well-being of our cities and the citizens who live in them:

Programs	Funds requested— Fiscal year 1968
Crime control.....	\$50,000,000
Firearms control.....	
Civil Rights Act of 1967.....	
Juvenile delinquency.....	25,000,000
Economic Opportunity Act....	2,060,000,000
Model cities.....	662,000,000
Rent supplements.....	40,000,000
Urban renewal.....	750,000,000
Urban mass transit, advance appropriation.....	230,000,000
Urban research.....	20,000,000
Neighborhood facilities.....	42,000,000
Home rehabilitation.....	15,000,000
Family relocation assistance.....	62,000,000
Rat extermination.....	20,000,000
Elementary-Secondary Education Act.....	1,600,000,000
Manpower Development and Training Act.....	439,000,000
Food stamps.....	195,000,000

Programs	Funds requested— Fiscal year 1968
Child nutrition and school lunch program.....	\$348,000,000
Community health services....	30,000,000
Mental health.....	96,000,000
Mental retardation.....	25,000,000
Hospital modernization (Hill-Burton).....	50,000,000
Maternal and Infant care....	30,000,000

All of these programs have been pending before the Congress since the beginning of this session and are included in our January budget.

The task before us is immense. But we have charted a beginning—and we have done so with the help of the best and most experienced minds in the Nation. I believe the enactment and funding of these programs is the first step in making this commitment a reality for the people of America.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Sunday's Washington Star carried a serious and thoughtful analysis of the Peace Corps and its promise to America for a new form of community, national, and world service based on freedom and responsibility—on what author Harris Wofford called its soul. Mr. Wofford formerly was associated with the Peace Corps in Africa, Mr. President, and writes from the State University College at Old Westbury, N.Y., where he is president.

His article demands attention and I ask that unanimous consent be given for its inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEACE CORPS' ULTIMATE VALUE TO YOUTH

(NOTE.—Harris Wofford, now president of the State University College at Old Westbury, N.Y., was until January associate director of the Peace Corps. As special assistant to President Kennedy, he worked on the original task force establishing the Peace Corps. From 1962–64, he was the Peace Corps' special representative for Africa and director of its volunteer teacher program in Ethiopia.)

(By Harris Wofford)

A leading Russian educator, serving as a delegate to a recent international conference, was speaking privately to an American friend after having officially attacked the Peace Corps as a neoimperialist, CIA-plot. "We can send out propagandists and technical experts, but we could not turn our young people loose all around the world," he conceded reluctantly. "I must admit that you have created something extremely interesting that probably reflects important things about your society."

What is the Peace Corps amounting to, now that it is six years old?

Is it producing a new breed of teachers and public servants and better-educated Americans? Does it point to a new kind of education and politics? Does the scope it gives to amateurs suggest the possibility of a 20th Century Renaissance man, a realization of Jefferson's dream, a modern embodiment of Mark Twain's Connecticut Yankee? Or is it all a flash in the night, a rocket set up by President Kennedy that will soon run out of fire and speed?

The Peace Corps was indeed an amazing creation for any government. A kind of anti-bureaucratic bureaucracy, its basic principle was volunteering and individual initiative. Its product and constituent—the Peace Corps volunteer—was at conception a strange animal, the most free-wheeling amateur any

government ever commissioned as its agent and ambassador. And the volunteer exemplified and engendered the freedom—the capacity for self-government—that the Peace Corps was designed to promote in the world, a remarkable combination of ends and means.

ITS IMAGE

In the beginning people were taken by surprise, but some of that surprise has worn off. Has this new bureaucratic animal already reached middle age? What is the present state of the Peace Corps? In the light of the experience of over 25,000 volunteers in 50 countries, does the Peace Corps tell us something important about American society?

It is said that a society can be measured by its saints—or by its sinners; by whom it declares to be, and how it treats its heroes and its underworld. But there is a readier test: its youth. The Peace Corps is one important measure of the spirit and health of the generation to whom Kennedy tried to pass the torch.

Not noted for a high ratio of sinners and still notably free of scandal, the Peace Corps has sometimes seemed to wear a halo. But this "image" is just what the volunteers like least. As a cross-section of a cool generation, they are repelled by what George Bernard Shaw called "the awful odor of goodness," a skepticism about "doing good against people" that has been compounded by the good we are doing the people of Vietnam by bombing them.

Nevertheless, in an age of nonheroes, the Peace Corps comes as close to a collective American hero as anything else this country has recently produced. That about half a million Americans have applied to be volunteers is certainly a big item on the right side of our national ledger. That the rate of applications has continued to increase, with no apparent lessening of quality, and in fact with some increase in quality in terms of skills and training, is a sign that a substantial part of the student generation is not dropping out. They are turning on in large numbers to the difficult challenges involved in Peace Corps service.

LEARNING RAPIDLY

David Riesman, author of "The Lonely Crowd," has described the nature and implications of these challenges. "The Peace Corps is no exotic junket, made socially defensible by primarily physical strenuousness," he says. "What it does do is to put people into positions of awesome and complicated responsibility." After visiting volunteers in Latin America, Riesman concluded that through their "terrifying and illuminating" experiences, they were getting "experience in mastering new situations and in learning rapidly," and thus were enlarging their definitions of what they were capable of. For example, he wrote:

"Many had become self-trained anthropologists in villages whose complicated networks of influence, malice and rare benevolence no one had mapped yet, and where any small mistake could have catastrophic consequences for the volunteer and his project and perhaps for the whole cadre of volunteers. Even those who go out to apparently more structured jobs, as teachers do, may discover that the schools to which they have been sent haven't been built yet, or have fallen in, or are embroiled in the kinds of struggles over authority that are not unknown in school systems elsewhere. A change of government can topple a program, and indeed any one of a thousand things can go wrong . . . In a society where some people desperately want and need them, while others fear and resent them, they have perforce to become diplomats without portfolio, in a language in which they feel awkward, among customs easily and unknowingly violated."

In most measurable ways, the Peace Corps is in good shape. It has survived the loss of the White House dramatization that Kennedy

repeatedly gave it, and the loss of its organizing genius, Sargent Shriver, the most creative, effective and hard-driving public administrator in recent American history. Its second director, Jack Vaughn, is making it more professional; he is requiring more careful programming; he has increased the overseas supervising staff; he has stiffened language requirements for the volunteers in training and while overseas.

"SOUL" OF THE CORPS

But the Peace Corps defies that kind of measurement. It was born as an idea and spirit, and it will die when they die. Once it becomes just another agency, well-programmed or not, it will not be the creature that took the world by surprise. What would it profit us for the Peace Corps to increase tenfold and win the approval of a hundred other countries, and lose its soul?

What is the "soul" of the Peace Corps? Stalin was once told by a visiting philosopher that he had been impressed with many of Russia's material achievements, but still found something missing. "What is missing?" asked the old dictator. "The soul," said the philosopher. "What is this thing called 'soul'?" asked Stalin. "That which you have not got," said the philosopher.

The Peace Corps' "soul is that which no other government has got with anything like the spirit and scope of the Peace Corps, which no other overseas agency of the U.S. government has got. It is the combination of freedom and responsibility, and trust in people—trust in the capacity and will of the younger generation particularly—that makes the Peace Corps unique.

Don't trust anyone under 30, Plato warned. Kennedy and Shriver disregarded that advice, and their trust was returned in full measure. Shriver would never let anyone on the staff call the volunteers "kids." They are men and women, he said, old enough for the Army to want them as soldiers; old enough for the country to ask them to undertake important responsibilities; old enough to expect them to carry these out best in conditions of maximum freedom.

At first in every country to which volunteers were sent, there was suspicion that they were, if not spies, at least propaganda agents. The debacle of CIA involvement in international student and educational affairs has no doubt reawakened and strengthened that suspicion, though two Presidents and both directors of the Peace Corps have forced the CIA to keep its hands off the Peace Corps. (The CIA is under orders not to employ any Peace Corps volunteer even years after his overseas service.) What most often makes honest human relations dissolves foreign suspicion and possible is the obvious honesty of the volunteers.

DANGER SIGNS

By being themselves, volunteers make foreign friends; they also contribute to their friends' understanding of America. (One of the Peace Corps' statutory purposes is to promote a better understanding of America on the part of other people.) By being examples of American freedom they are making visible what, for too many people around the world, has usually been invisible about America—our relatively open society.

There are danger signs, however. This spring volunteers began in mounting numbers to write letters-to-the-editor or sign petitions protesting American policy in Vietnam. The Peace Corps sent out a directive ordering them not to do either in such a way as to be identified as Peace Corps volunteers, and specified that they should not write using their overseas address. If they insisted upon expressing themselves on such a controversial issue, they should send their letters via their parents or friends in the U.S., so as not to bring the Peace Corps in any way into the picture.

The caution is understandable. The President does not appreciate opposition, espe-

cially from within his own family, and as the former head of the Peace Corps National Advisory Council, he has reason to feel close to the Peace Corps. He wants to allow our soldiers to fight this war in peace. If he begins to hear about volunteer protests, the Peace Corps may lose his support.

Nor will controversial positions by volunteers enhance the Peace Corps' immediate standing in Congress or the country. Until now the Peace Corps has had a virginal quality that placed it somewhere between motherhood and the Boy Scouts.

President Johnson will remember how in the early days he helped Sargeant Shriver even against a decision of President Kennedy. A presidential task force had recommended against any real independence for the Peace Corps; it said the new agency should be a part of the Agency for International Development. Shriver fought within the White House and lost. Finally he took his case to Lyndon Johnson, who intervened personally and persuaded Kennedy to reverse the decision. To win in Congress and public opinion, he said, the new wine has to be in a new bottle.

The Peace Corps' separate bureaucratic bottle is not in jeopardy, but the quality of its wine is. The forces for conformity are powerful in the government and in society generally, especially in a time of war. Fortunately, the force for autonomy within the Peace Corps is strong, too.

Despite the directive from Washington, volunteers have continued to sign "Negotiation Now" petitions and to write letters-to-the-editor identifying themselves as Peace Corps volunteers. One volunteer in Chile had his service terminated and was sent home, but his case was confused by the fact that he had published his letter in a Chilean newspaper as well as in the U.S.; the Peace Corps based his termination on this alleged intervention in Chilean politics. Then five volunteers in Ecuador published a letter in the New York Times protesting both the administration's policy in Vietnam and the Peace Corps' policy of curtailing volunteer protests. Equivocating, the Peace Corps decided not to terminate their service, on the ground that their letter was primarily protesting Peace Corps policy—but the original directive was still in force.

At this point, with ex-volunteers, members of the National Advisory Council, the Civil Liberties Union and others protesting the policy, corps director Vaughn visited Latin America and found many of the best volunteers also strongly disagreeing with the corps' policy. He reversed himself, a strong step for any man, and especially for one influenced by the Latin idea of machismo, or manliness.

ESSENTIAL RIGHTS

The prohibition against a volunteer's interference in the politics of the host country does not require limitation of a volunteer's essential rights as a citizen, including his right to petition his own government—or write a letter-to-the-editor of a paper in the U.S.—on matters of U.S. policy. But at stake, even more than the volunteer's individual right to say anything that he wants to say about American policy, is the American public need to hear anything relevant to its self-government. The views of Peace Corps volunteers as Peace Corps volunteers, rising out of their special experience in other parts of the world, whether expressed separately or in joint petition, are certainly relevant to a matter such as the war in Vietnam.

Whether Peace Corps volunteers are more than a permanently adolescent gadfly, whether the Peace Corps is more than an exception that proves the rule, will depend on whether the rest of us, particularly leaders of American education, business and government, are stirred to a new vision of education that fuses theory and practice, on campus and out in community action; and to a new vision of politics that cuts through

ideology and partisanship to a politics of service; whether we map our national needs and see the opportunities for applying the Peace Corps' experience in new forms of community, national and world service; whether we dare to practice on a much wider scale what we preach.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to talk about Job Corps. It is a program of vital importance to all of us for it serves the most disadvantaged in all the States and territories of this Nation. Have you heard of Ethyl, La.; Bradley, Ark.; Picher, Okla.; Hooksett, N.H.; Caribou, Maine; or Groveland, Mass.?

Job Corps has. Youth from these as well as thousands of other small communities are being served for the first time. Towns that do not appear on any map, youth that have never seen a doctor—no less a hospital—parents who cannot afford shoes for their children to go to schools, which sometimes do not exist: all have another chance through this program.

And for the first time, the many resources of this Nation, both public and private, are initiating extensive outreach to needy youth. The State employment services, rural community action programs, the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, the AFL-CIO, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, private businesses, urban leagues have joined in this search and aid program. One of the major reasons is that but for Job Corps there is no alternative to failure for many of our rural youth.

And what about the inner-cities? Today Job Corps is serving almost one-third more youth than a year ago. The number of Spanish-speaking youth has significantly increased. Every major city in this country has sent its representative to Job Corps. And while we speak of Job Corpsmen from all over the Nation, it is important to note that Job Corps is sending youth over 400 miles closer to home today than a year ago. These representatives from our communities are returning as ambassadors of good will. And this is one of the aims of the program.

Once recruited, our youngsters have shown marked disciplinary and conduct improvements which are reflected in overall reduction of incident rates. In December of 1966, the Job Corps arrest rate was 3.18 percent per 100 youth as against the FBI annual standard population rate for the 16-to-21 age population rate of 6.5 percent. In May of 1967, the Job Corps rate dropped further to 2.81 percent per 100, notwithstanding that our youth come from the lowest socioeconomic stratum. In other words, the arrest rate for Job Corps enrollees is more than 50 percent less than that of the total population in the same age range. It should also be pointed out that the arrest rate includes all types of offenses, most of which are simple disorders, and the conviction rate is less than three-quarters of those arrested. On-center disorders have become a rarity, and none have involved more than three youngsters at any time. Nationwide, our youngsters were conspicuous by their absence from participation in riots though normal leaves continued

and some Job Corps members were in the vicinity of riot-torn cities during the outbreaks.

The record reflects a further important improvement in our program as relates to citizenship and moral support. At the beginning of the Job Corps program only 54 percent of the Corps members were sending allotments home, which generally amounts to \$50 a month. As the number of enrollees increased, the percentage of allotments to their families has increased. As of August 31, 1967, 79 percent or 29,541 Corps members were sending allotments home. It can be easily recognized that the youth who have come into our program have a deep feeling or responsibility to their families. The majority of allotments are being sent to mothers of Corps members to help alleviate poverty conditions in the home.

Further, Corps members have shown an awareness and concern for the care of their minor children by their inclusion in the allotment program who were previously welfare charges. We anticipate that by the end of this fiscal year, approximately 85 percent of our Corps members will be sending allotments home.

Some time ago, I read a Job Corps recruitment flyer. It said "Be Somebody—Join Job Corps." We must not take this chance away from our neighbors. I am thrilled at the opportunities Job Corps is providing to youth from every hidden and apparent pocket of poverty in the land. Youth who would never be touched by our prosperity, who have suffered the greatest from low education, frightening living conditions, and broken families are finding an open door never before unlocked to them.

This door—Job Corps—must remain open for the greater need and good of us all.

NOT EVERYONE REALIZES THE PURPOSE BEHIND THE JOB CORPS CONSERVATION CENTERS

Mr. HART. What this program does is to take a young man or woman, age 16 through 21, away from our ghettos, from our depressed areas, from our Indian reservations, and put them in an environment that is suited to their total needs; not just their educational needs or their health needs or their vocational skill training needs or their personal guidance needs—but all of these combined.

Now some people may say it does not make sense to take young men from Harlem and have them pick up sticks in our Nation's forests and parks. Those who say this may not be aware of the objective in removing these youth from their environment and the type of training they get at these centers.

About 20 percent of these youth in conservation centers are illiterate, have had no motivation to work, and have come from homes in which the parent had not worked. They have not even been taught elementary, basic hygiene needs. Their appearance alone would prevent many from getting jobs, even if they had a little skill. Others have health needs so severe—missing teeth, undernourishment, poor eyesight—that they could not get jobs. They lacked the vision

to see a way out, to learn the skills to get a job until the Job Corps came along.

So what the Job Corps is doing is giving a young man from Harlem the experience of learning good work habits while being taught the remedial education necessary to read a vocational manual and learn a job skill. The environment, the food, the guidance counselors, while at the Job Corps, all serve to stimulate his desire to achieve the education necessary to obtain jobs.

Even among our more affluent youngsters, summer camps and the outdoors have played a very important part in helping them to adjust to situations of personal distress. Surely, this is applicable with the most deprived. I therefore hope that we will continue a program to train another 90,000 young men and women in our 127 Job Corps centers throughout the country during this fiscal year and those young men in conservation centers are an integral part of this program.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SENATOR ERIC DE SCHAETZEN OF THE KINGDOM OF BELGIUM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am happy to introduce at this time a distinguished Senator from one of our oldest and warmest allies, the great Kingdom of Belgium. I am very happy to present Senator Eric De Schaetzen, a member of the Upper House of Belgium, who is escorted by the Belgian Ambassador, Baron Louis Scheyven, who is acting as Senator De Schaetzen's interpreter.

Senator DeSchaetzen is visiting the United States with his wife. He is very interested in comparing the operation of the Belgian House and Senate with our two houses. Their House and Senate are somewhat similar to ours, except that Senators may not trespass upon the floor of the House of Representatives in Belgium, nor may the House members trespass upon the floor of the Senate.

It is a great honor to have them here, and I know that the Senate appreciates this opportunity to have them visit with us. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is honored to have your presence, sir.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the parliamentary inquiry I am about to address to the distinguished occupant of the chair has no relation to the remarks just made by the distinguished Senator from Maine nor to the interventions made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

As a matter of fact, I had asked the Senator from Pennsylvania to come to the floor, to be here when I addressed this parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. President, Senators will note that this bill, of some 125 printed pages, is divided into two titles. The first title, with the preliminary part which sets up the authorization for an appropriation for that title only, is title I, and it is named "Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act." That title occupies the first 119 pages of the printed bill.

The second title is styled "Emergency Employment Act." That title begins at page 120 and runs to the end of page 126.

Without describing these in any detail, I simply want to have the RECORD show that they are both extremely important; that the authorization for the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act comprise a total for 1 year of some \$2,258,000,000 and an "open ended" second-year authorization and that the authorization for title II, Emergency Employment Act, is an authorization for \$2.8 billion.

Mr. President, my parliamentary inquiry is this: Assuming that both of these titles remain in the bill, would I have the right, as a Senator, to ask for a division of these two titles, so as to have separate votes upon them at the time the bill is ready for final action?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Presiding Officer that the Senator from Florida would not have the right to have the titles divided. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that there is a clear precedent which upholds the ruling.

I would like to have the Parliamentarian give the Chair the precedent so that the Chair may read it to the Senator from Florida.

The precedent reads as follows:

A bill or joint resolution which has been read the third time, and the question is put on its passage, is not susceptible of a division under the rule relating to division of amendments even though it contains several distinct and unrelated titles, but must be voted upon as a whole; a single vote must be taken on its passage.

The Senator from Florida will find that language on page 357 of Senate Procedure, by Mr. Watkins and Mr. Riddick. The footnotes contain the documentation in support of the ruling.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is familiar with that ruling, but he thinks it is not the controlling ruling.

At any rate, at this time all that I wished to do was to serve notice that if both of these titles remain in the bill at the time the bill comes on for final vote I shall ask for a division so that Senators may be allowed the opportunity to vote separately on amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, which is title I, and upon the totally new measure in title II, which is the Emergency Employment Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is clearly within his rights to serve this notice. The Senator from Florida also understands that at the time he raises this parliamentary inquiry, if at that time the then-Presiding Officer supports the ruling which the Chair laid down this afternoon, the Senator from Florida will be within his rights to appeal the decision of the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer. I am familiar with that right.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have a few insertions that I would like to make before this working day is over.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a document entitled "Questions and Answers About VISTA," which deals with a colloquy I had with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] earlier in the day, may be printed in the RECORD. I have discussed this matter with the Senator from West Virginia and made several changes in it at his suggestion.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT VISTA

Mr. President, last Friday during the opening debate on the 1967 Economic Opportunity Act amendments my distinguished colleague Senator Robert Byrd, of West Virginia, raised some pertinent questions concerning one of the most successful and valuable of the anti-poverty programs.

Volunteers In Service To America, popularly known as VISTA, has compiled a brilliant record in some of the most difficult assignments issued anywhere in the anti-poverty campaign. Their work has been relatively unpublicized; but it has been hardship work, arduous, self-sacrificing, yet rewarding.

At the present time the total number of Volunteers in the field and in training is 3851 and 18% increase over a year ago. Altogether, nearly 8300 Americans have entered VISTA since the program began.

VISTA Volunteers are currently serving on 420 projects in 48 states, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

The value of VISTA Volunteers and their work is clearly reflected in the swift increase in the number of requests for their projects. Last year at this time there were requests for 13,580 VISTA Volunteers to serve on 1101 projects. Today those figures are nearly 50% higher with nearly 19,000 Volunteers requested to serve on more than 1500 projects.

More than 206,000 citizens have written letters expressing an interest in VISTA, with the number of last month's letters 80% higher than for the same month a year ago.

Even a hurried examination of VISTA programs and their volunteers is extremely revealing.

Currently there are 127 rural projects in 37 states involving 942 Volunteers.

VISTA now has 58 projects operating on 58 Indian reservations in 20 States and using 304 Volunteers.

VISTA's excellent, and badly needed work with migrant workers is now functioning through 18 projects in 13 States and with 118 Volunteers.

Urban projects now number 158 in 35 states involving 1635 Volunteers.

VISTA's work with the Job Corps is found in 46 projects in 24 states with 95 Volunteers.

And finally VISTA's mental health efforts are now centered in 13 projects in 12 states with 165 Volunteers.

The total national picture of VISTA emerges as one of a dedicated organization moved by an abiding sense of humanitarianism, altruism and idealism; an organization that has developed skills and loyalties which have contributed greatly to the alleviation of poverty, hunger, disease and ignorance. The country has reason to be proud of the organization and proud of the individual Volunteers.

With this as background I would like to take up the questions raised Friday by the Junior Senator from West Virginia.

Senator Byrd inquired whether the governor of a state has the privilege of vetoing the operations of VISTA within his state. I replied on Friday that the governor certainly does have that veto privilege and I repeat that again today. The privilege is stated under

Section 810(b) of the present OEO legislation.

The Senator also inquired as to how many such vetoes have occurred. The answer to that question is that in only one instance has a governor's approval been withheld for any proposed VISTA project. Mississippi has consistently vetoed any and all VISTA programs. And in this connection, it should be mentioned that in addition to the 48 states in which VISTA is currently operating, one other state is now in the process of receiving VISTAS.

Senator Byrd said that considerable dissatisfaction had been indicated on the part of many of his constituents with regard to VISTA. The best answer to his question—and perhaps the most authoritative one—may be a letter written to VISTA this past summer by the Director of West Virginia's Department of Mental Health. The Director, Dr. M. Mitchell-Bateman, sent the following statement to the Deputy Director of VISTA:

"I am writing you because I know of your interest in the problems of mental health in West Virginia, and because I thought you would be interested in a report on the work the VISTA Volunteers are doing here.

"The effectiveness of the VISTAs has been tremendous, even greater than we had hoped for. They have made a major contribution both to our mental hospitals and our communities. And what too few people realize is that they have not only helped the mentally ill, they have actually saved the state hundreds of thousands of dollars a year.

"Some VISTAs work in hospitals, directly with patients, and enable many to be discharged earlier than would be possible with present limited hospital staffs. Because of VISTAs in the hospitals, an estimated six hundred patients were released in the last fiscal year an average of thirty days earlier than they would have been. In round figures, these early discharges represent a saving to the state of \$81,000 a year.

"Most VISTAs work in communities. They see patients home from state mental hospitals on trial visit or after discharge. Many men and women are able to stay out of mental hospitals because VISTAs in the community see them, discuss their problems, get services for them when necessary. We estimate that because of VISTA, many former patients stayed out three months longer, on the average, than they would have if no VISTA volunteer had been working with them. In round figures, based on one thousand patients staying out an average of three months each, these delayed returns to the hospitals represent a saving to the state of West Virginia of \$405,000 a year.

"On an annual mental hospital budget of eight and a quarter million dollars, savings of \$486,000 are considerable, and allow the Department to give better services to those in our hospitals. The state mental hospitals, incidentally, are operating at about 170% of capacity.

"VISTA volunteers are also working in other capacities in communities across the state. One young man is training local people to be Boy Scout leaders so that there will be Boy Scout troops in rural areas for the first time. Most important, these troops will be run by the local people themselves, with benefits to the leaders, the boys, and the community. Other VISTAs have organized day care centers for children, tutoring programs for elementary and high school students, special programs for the retarded. In all these activities, they are training local people to take over when the VISTAs leave. This is really a program in which VISTAs try to work themselves out of a job.

"Some VISTA volunteers have been helpful to County Courts in planning mental health programs to serve all the people of the county. VISTAs work with state agencies on programs relating to mental health: Vocational

Rehabilitation, Welfare, Education, Health and others.

"It is difficult to put a price tag on their activities, but it is significant that with VISTAs working in fifty-one of West Virginia's fifty-five counties, the counties themselves have undertaken to contribute to the support of VISTA programs. You know how tight county budgets are, and when you have a depressed rural county going into its own budget to buy a car so that a VISTA worker can get around to people and carry on his duties, you know the program is meeting the needs of the local people. At this moment, twelve such cars are being used by VISTAs, at an estimated cost of \$130 a month each. Another dozen such cars will be in use within the year.

"Ninety VISTAs are working in various community assignments at a cost to the community in office space, telephone service and consultation estimated conservatively at \$100 a month each, this nine thousand dollar monthly expenditure being only one token of the community's need for and acceptance of the VISTAs.

"There is another aspect of VISTAs work which could be translated into dollars, although the total benefit to the individual and the community are far beyond any immediate price tag. I quote from the report of one VISTA mental health worker in a county which has experienced a severe economic decline.

"I helped Mrs. C., who was discharged from the hospital and has been drawing a welfare check, to get a job taking care of a semi-invalid. She is doing well on the job, and the woman she is caring for is so pleased with her. The other day I went with Mrs. C. to the welfare office so that she could return her check and tell them she is now able to take care of herself and doesn't need welfare money any longer. What a proud day that was!"

"A most significant result of VISTA service in the Department of Mental Health in West Virginia is that we are now planning a three-year program to recruit and train local workers from the poverty level who will be employed to render the same kinds of services VISTAs give today. Anticipating the eventual termination of the present VISTA program, we are preparing to assume greater local responsibility. Four hundred and twenty West Virginians are to be trained within the three year program to provide more than triple the manpower of VISTAs now in the mental health project.

"We have found the VISTA volunteers a most important part of our program for planning comprehensive mental health services for all the people of West Virginia, and we are most grateful to all who have made this special project possible.

"Sincerely,

"M. MITCHELL-BATEMAN, M.D.,
"Director."

There has been praise, also, from Governor Hulett C. Smith of West Virginia, who has not only authorized and approved the work of 153 full-time VISTA Volunteers on 15 projects throughout West Virginia, but has repeatedly expressed strong personal support for their work among the poor.

Last May Governor Smith visited VISTA Volunteer trainees at Weston, West Virginia, at their graduation ceremony and wished them well in their endeavors.

Just last month, on August 18, 1967, Governor Smith declared, during a press conference in Charleston:

"Our experience with VISTA in West Virginia has been highly successful, particularly in the field of mental health where the VISTA volunteers are performing great services to the citizens of many of our communities."

In addition to the support and approval of such state officials as Governor Smith and

Dr. Bateman, VISTA Volunteers serving in West Virginia have inspired confidence and support from local community groups and citizens. At present, there are on file over 40 requests in the OEO office for additional VISTA projects in West Virginia. These requests have originated from local groups, charities, agencies, and institutions in West Virginia. These project requests have specified the need for 471 additional VISTA Volunteers to serve in poverty areas in West Virginia.

The humanitarian and selfless work performed by VISTA Volunteers in a wide range of projects in West Virginia has set a good example for local citizens. More than 671 West Virginians have applied to the OEO for VISTA Service and 53 of them are presently serving as VISTA Volunteers offering their skills and concern to their fellow Americans.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letters and telegrams, each of them supporting title II of the pending bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD. The first is a letter from Joseph M. Barr, president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and who is also the mayor of Pittsburgh, urging the enactment of title II of the act; second is a telegram from John M. Lumley, director, National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations. I think that this telegram is particularly significant, coming, as it does, from the National Education Association; third, is a letter addressed to me by Carl J. Megel, director of legislation for the American Federation of Teachers; and, finally, a telegram from Matthew Guinan, international president; Douglas L. MacMahon, international secretary-treasurer; James F. Horst, international executive vice president, Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, endorsing title II, the Emergency Employment Act portion of the bill.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: A few weeks ago the Urban Coalition, consisting of representatives of local governments, civil rights organizations, the business community, churches, and labor organizations called for an Emergency Work Program. Its goal was to provide one million worthwhile jobs for our unemployed. The United States Conference of Mayors joins this coalition in supporting the Clark-Javits "Emergency Employment Act of 1967" as a meaningful step towards that goal.

We urge your support of this modest proposal to attack one of the most serious problems facing our nation—joblessness and human despair in our slums.

Throughout the several months of hearings chaired by Senator Clark, the urgent need of jobs was a constant theme. Not only will a program such as the Emergency Employment Act envisage a step toward solving the great problem of slum unemployment but it will also contribute toward bringing dignity to our impoverished citizens. With the help of counseling, training and a worthwhile job these Americans can move to a meaningful and productive role in our society.

I urge you to be part of our national response to the national crisis of slum unemployment and vote for the "Emergency Employment Act of 1967."

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. BARR,
President.

NEA DIVISION OF
FEDERAL REGULATIONS,

Washington, D.C., September 22, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Education Association urges passage of S. 2388 as approved by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, to continue operation of economic opportunity programs and to establish the Emergency Employment Act.

JOHN M. LUMLEY,
Director.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
TEACHERS, AFL-CIO,

Washington, D.C., September 12, 1967.

Re Office of Economic Opportunity.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: The recent Convention of the American Federation of Teachers adopted a resolution recommended unanimously by its Committee on Legislation to support the continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs, with these considerations:

A. The American Federation of Teachers strongly supports the efforts of the Urban Coalition and Senator Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, including the \$3 billion grant proposed by the Senator, to wage massive war on poverty in our central cities, administered through the Office of Economic Opportunity, and involving matching efforts by city government, business, and labor in our nation's cities.

B. The American Federation of Teachers strongly urges the Congress to provide that Job Corps Centers—both urban and conservation—be expanded under the Office of Economic Opportunity, provided that guarantees are written into law for fair labor conditions and collective bargaining rights as defined otherwise by Federal law.

Sincerely,

CARL J. MEGEL,
Director of Legislation.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF
AMERICA, AFL-CIO,

New York, N.Y., September 22, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Passage of the anti-poverty bill (S. 2388) would be a big step in providing an effective antidote to the rash of disorders in our cities during the past summer. Experiences with past and present poverty programs have shown a direct relationship between successful job and training projects and peaceful communities.

We must increase our efforts in this direction if we are to make any meaningful progress in our fight against poverty and our striving to bring equal rights to all our people. The officers and members of the Transport Workers Union of America, AFL-CIO, urge your support for S. 2388 as a strong move in the direction of the prosperity and freedom that, we are sure, are the goals of all good Americans.

MATTHEW GUINAN,
International President.

DOUGLAS L. MACMAHON,
International Secretary-Treasurer,
JAMES F. HORST,

International Executive Vice President.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY-ONE ECONOMISTS
ENDORSE EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that 251 nationally known economists have endorsed the Emergency Employment Act—title 11 of the omnibus antipoverty legislation of 1967—which would appropriate \$2.8 billion to open up 500,000 public service jobs for the Nation's hard-core unemployed during the next 2 years.

A nationwide survey conducted by Dr. Garth L. Mangum, of George Washington University, Washington, D.C., found that the 251 economists—some connected with private organizations, but the majority with universities and colleges—strongly favor the Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. President, the roster of these economists includes a number of experts in the field of manpower and labor economics and also authorities who have appeared as witnesses before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, which I serve as chairman. Included in the list are these economists:

John T. Dunlop, Harvard University; Charles C. Killingsworth and Daniel H. Kruger, Michigan State; Robert Solow, MIT; Oscar Ornati, New York University; William H. Miernyk, West Virginia University; Gerald G. Somers, University of Wisconsin; Fred Harbeson, Princeton; Sar A. Levitan and Garth L. Mangum, George Washington University; and Vivian W. Henderson, Clark College.

Economists at the following universities and colleges were among the endorsees: Arizona State University, Brigham Young University, Carnegie Mellon University, City University of New York, Clark College, Duke University, George Washington University, Harvard University, Iowa State University, Michigan State University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, New York University, North Carolina State University, Ohio State University, Oklahoma State University, Pennsylvania State University, Rutgers University, Syracuse University, University of California, University of Illinois, University of Kentucky, University of Maryland, University of Utah, University of Wisconsin, Washington State University—St. Louis, Wayne State University, West Virginia University, Yale University, Swarthmore College, and Brooklyn College.

Endorsements also came from economists associated with the National Planning Association and the National Manpower Policy Task Force.

Following is the complist list of endorsements:

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

Richard B. Wirthlin, Martin T. Farris, Gerald R. Ladman, M. E. Bond, Neal Gooding, Donald V. Plantz, John A. Cochran, Richard D. Winkelman, Richard Yates, Aryn J. Larson, Dennis J. O'Conner, Robert L. Knox, Benjamin Taylor.

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY

Glen T. Nelson, Willard B. Doxey, J. Kenneth Davies, Wayne W. Clark, Dean Rickenbach, Merrill J. Bateman, Glen R. Foster, Larry T. Wimmer.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Economics Faculty, Graduate School of Industrial Administration: Michael C. Lovell, Timothy W. McGuire, David P. Ruttenberg, Lester B. Love, William W. Cooper, Myron L. Joseph.

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Maurice C. Benewitz, Alfred Conrad, Alan Spiro.

CLARK COLLEGE

Vivian W. Henderson.

DUKE UNIVERSITY

Juanita M. Kreps, John O. Blackburn, Thomas Naylor.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Sar A. Levitan, Garth L. Mangum.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Jonathan Baitzel, Peter B. Doeringer, John T. Dunlop, E. Robert Livernash, James G. Scoville, David Shapiro.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Edward B. Jakubauskas, James Alexander Socknat, Neil A. Palomba.

MICHIGAN STATE

Charles C. Killingsworth, Jack Stieber, Daniel H. Kruger, Bruce Allen, Walter Adams, John Henderson, Max Kreinin, Harry Trebing, Allan B. Mandelstamm, Subbiah Kannappan, Einar Hardin, Michael E. Brown.

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Karl L. Shell, Peter Temin, Everett E. Hagen, Paul MacAvoy, Robert M. Solow, Richard S. Eckaus, Evsey D. Domar, Peter A. Diamond, Franklin M. Fisher, Donald Farrar, Miguel Sidrauski, Edwin Kuh, Daniel M. Holland, Jerome Rothenberg, John Harris, Gerald Pogue, Douglas Brown, Charles A. Myers, Frederic Meyers, Abraham Siegal, Michael Piore, David Taylor.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

S. M. Miller, Oscar Ornati.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Leonard J. Hausman, Christopher Green.

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Herbert S. Parnes, Peter S. Barth, Paul G. Craig, Glenn W. Miller.

OKLAHOMA STATE

Julian H. Bradsher, Joseph J. Klos, Pauline W. Kopecky, Richard H. Leftwich, Richard L. Porter, John C. Shearer.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE

Jacob J. Kaufman, Michael Bradley, Grant Farr, Irwin Feller, A. H. Reede, Will E. Mason, Wesley Long, Edward C. Budd, Eugene Myers, David Stevens.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

Monroe Berkowitz, Richard Blackhurst, Michael Taussig, Stanley Masters, Jeffrey Schaefer, Paul Davidson, Robert Alexander, Marshal Kolin, Alex Balinsky, Roger H. Hinderliter, Collette Moser.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Melvin A. Eggers, Jerry Miner, Eric W. Lawson, Robert Wolfson, Seymour Sacks, Jesse Burkhead, John A. Henning, Dale Tusing, Edward J. Stevens, James Thornblade, Arnold Simson, James Price.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Berkeley, California: Robert A. Gordon, Margaret S. Gordon, Lloyd Ulman.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

V. Lewis Bessie, Hugh Folk, Fred M. Gottheil, Harold W. Guthrie, Joseph D. Phillips, Melvin Rothbaum, Herbert I. Schiller, Vladimir L. Stoilov.

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

Ray Marshall, Joseph Krislov, Carl Erwin, John Madden, Niles Hansen, Walter Pearce, Richard Gift, L. Randolph McGee, David F. Ross, Charles Haywood, Alan R. Winger, Robert H. Stroup, Virgil Christian, Hugh Pitcher.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

Prof. Robert Knight, Dudley Dillard, Charles Peake, Neil M. Singer, Thomas H. Mayor, Robert L. Bennett, Barbara Bergmann, Paul Meyer, Myra Strober, Thomas Havrilesky, Milton Lower.

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

R. Thayne Robson, Reed C. Richardson, Boyd Fjeldsted, Lawrence Nabors, Joseph S. Perry, Richard C. Bernhard, Jewell J. Rasmussen, Claron Nelson, Ivar Brandley, Frank C. Hochman.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Gerald G. Somers, Arthur S. Goldberger, Harold Watts, Martin H. David, David B. Johnson, Jack Barbash, James L. Stern,

Everett M. Kallalow, Ralph L. Andreano, Glen G. Cain, Donald Nichols, Allen C. Kelley, Murray A. Tucker, John D. Bowman, Earl Brubaker, Laurits R. Christensen.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Walter R. Butcher, Dr. Walter Slocum, Dr. Gary Sorenson, Dr. Ralph Thayer, Dr. Warren Gramm.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

St. Louis, Missouri: Edward Kalachek, David Barkin, Hyman P. Minsky, Edward Greenberg, Trout Radar, Theodore Bergstrom, Harold J. Barnett, Charles L. Leven, Marshall Hall, George W. McKenzie.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Gebhard D. Long, John E. Tower, John M. Mattila, Lon Polk, Larry B. Singell, Bernard Goodman, Stuart Schweitzer, Richard F. Kosobud, Mark L. Kahn.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

William H. Miernyk, Kenneth L. Shellhammer, Donald E. Russell, Robert J. Saunders, Carl W. Hale, James H. Thompson, Richard D. Raymond, Raymond A. McKay, Vance Allen, Woo Sik Kee, Gilbert Britman, Betty G. Fishman, Leo Fishman.

YALE UNIVERSITY

E. Wight Bakke.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

Clair Wilcox, Mrs. Zora Pryor, Frederic L. Pryor, Frank Pierson.

NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICY TASK FORCE

Arnold Nemore.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE

Prof. Harry Malisoff, Edward Marcus, Dean Sol Jacobson, Dean Louis Fler.

NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION

Leonard A. Lecht, Marshall K. Wood, Philip M. Ritz, Mannie Kupinsky, Norman Frumkin, Joyce G. Powell.

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE SUPPORTS EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Mr. President, I would like also to place in the RECORD at this point an excellent statement on S. 2388, the anti-poverty bill, and on the Emergency Employment Act, by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. This organization is a coalition of 112 national civil rights, labor, and religious organizations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights gives its wholehearted endorsement to S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Act, as reported by the Senate Labor Committee, and particular endorsement to the Clark-Javits amendment establishing the Emergency Employment Act of 1967.

These proposals, together, would bring us significantly closer to the goal of the Conference, "an integrated, democratic, plural society in which every individual is accorded equal rights, equal opportunities and equal justice. . . ." In our statement of purpose we recognize that civil rights cannot be considered in any narrow sense but must also mean "the realization of social and economic conditions in which alone the fulfillment of these rights is possible." The proposals that will be before the Senate shortly will help create the necessary conditions.

One of the most pressing concerns of our urban and rural poor is decent jobs. Without them, the rights that the Leadership Conference has fought to advance for nearly two decades can be virtually meaningless. President John F. Kennedy put it vividly when he said, "No one gains by being admitted to a lunch counter if he has no money to spend. . . . No one thinks much of the right to own a good home and to sleep in a good hotel or go to a theater if he has no money and no work. . . ."

In his Poverty Message to Congress this year, President Johnson observed that while many Americans have found employment during the three years of the War on Poverty, "economic policy and unprecedented prosperity have not reached thousands of men and women who live in the nation's slums."

The Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act with its immediate promise of 200,000 new jobs the first year and 300,000 jobs the year after that, would begin to move thousands of the unemployed and unskilled poor into a position where they can become functioning members of American society, able to enjoy their constitutional rights.

The battle cry of the Civil Rights Movement in the March on Washington, August 28, 1963, was "Jobs and Freedom." The 112 national civil rights, religious, labor and civic organizations in the Conference believe we can help make that cry a reality by urging all members of Congress to vote for the Economic Opportunity Act in the form in which it is now before the Senate of the United States.

AFL-CIO INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT SUPPORTS EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I would also like to place in the RECORD at this point a letter from Jack T. Conway, executive director of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, which represents 6,500,000 workers in 60 unions. This is a strong statement of support for S. 2388 and for the Emergency Employment Act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT,
AFL-CIO,
Washington, D.C., September 19, 1967.

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: The Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO enthusiastically supports S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 and the Emergency Employment Act. To eliminate poverty among 30 million Americans as quickly as possible is the most important issue before this Congress. S. 2388 makes real progress toward that goal.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has demonstrated its capacity to serve as an effective advocate of the poor by supporting imaginative and innovative programs that help the poor help themselves out of poverty. The experience over the last three years calls for OEO to continue as the central anti-poverty agency of the Federal government. Consequently, we oppose transfer of any OEO programs to other agencies. The inevitable effect of such transfers would be to end the unique contribution OEO has made as an anti-poverty program innovator and advocate for the poor. Through national emphasis programs such as Head Start and local community action programs, public attention is now focused on the problems of poverty. Successful efforts are now being made to end poverty. This momentum must be maintained and accelerated.

Coupled with extension of OEO programs is the urgent need to provide jobs in urban and rural areas with high concentrations of unemployment. This is a necessary condition of waging any real war on poverty and of attaining full employment.

We believe it is inexcusable that, given our high levels of productivity and technology, two of every three of those heading the nation's seven million impoverished families either have no opportunity for employment at decent wages or must content themselves with inadequate opportunities at dead-end and poorly paid jobs. The Emergency Employment provision of S. 2388 makes a significant start in correcting this condition. It

establishes that society has a responsibility to guarantee jobs for those willing and able to work but who are unemployed. It would provide opportunities for citizens to contribute productively to many of society's needs and offers them a chance to embark on a personally satisfying career.

This legislation would provide meaningful public service and non-profit private jobs that concentrate on the huge backlog of our needs in health, recreation, education, public facilities, municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development.

Emergency work is a proposal that has been studied and supported by Presidential and statutory commissions: the National Commission on Automation, Technology and Economic Progress, that Public Welfare Advisory Council, the National Crime Commission, and the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber all supported creating jobs for those willing and able to work.

We urge that you support the retention of the Emergency Employment Act in S. 2388. To either delete this provision or to make it a separate bill amounts to killing it. The issue has been studied at length. The time for action is now. We urge that S. 2388 be supported as reported by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Sincerely yours,

JACK T. CONWAY,
Executive Director.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to ask the leadership, to make sure that I am advised if I am not on the floor just prior to the time that the bill is placed for third reading, for at that time I shall certainly ask that the two titles be divided, if they are still in the bill.

I understand from the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that there will probably be an amendment addressed to title II, seeking to strike it. If that amendment is successful there would be no occasion to ask for a division. If that amendment is not successful, regardless of the way the vote goes, it would be my position that Senators should have the right to pass on these separate issues by separate votes. I shall ask for a division at that time.

Therefore, I ask the acting majority leader to make sure that I am advised before the bill is placed for third reading.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The leadership is happy to be informed by the Senator from Florida as to his wishes in this regard, and the leadership will make every effort to see that he is advised just prior to the third reading of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the bill is now open to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the amendment of the Senator from Washington is pending. Since a time has been set for a vote on the amendment it would require unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this time.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the ruling of the Chair and the further fact that I believe it has been agreed that the amendment of the Senator from Wash-

ington [Mr. JACKSON] will be voted on not later than 2:30 p.m. tomorrow, and since there are no other Senators present who desire to speak or file amendments, I suggest to the acting majority leader that this might be a good time to adjourn.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

NEW FORESTRY SCIENCES LABORATORY AT MORGANTOWN, W. VA.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Saturday, September 23, 1967, I spoke at the dedication of the new Forestry Sciences Laboratory at Morgantown, W. Va. I ask unanimous consent to insert my printed remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE FORESTRY SCIENCE LABORATORY, MORGANTOWN, W. VA., SEPTEMBER 23, 1967

It is always a pleasure to help dedicate a fine new building such as this one and it gives me even greater pleasure to know that these ceremonies mark only the beginning of the benefits which this facility will bring to the city of Morgantown, the State of West Virginia, and the United States.

Our State is fortunate to have two other forestry laboratories located within its borders. These are at Parsons and at Princeton. And with the dedication of this third laboratory here at Morgantown I think we can say, with no little pride, that these laboratories give West Virginia a special lustre and that West Virginia is fast becoming the hub of forestry research activities in the northeastern United States.

But these laboratories are simply bricks and stone without the skill and vision of the men who man them. These men are seeking to unlock the giant potential which is locked within our forests.

Our forests are one of our most historic and treasured natural resources. They are not only a thing of beauty but they are economically valuable and, if harvested wisely, self-renewing. If conserved, our forests will give of their bounty for generations to come.

The key to this conservation of resources is research.

For if we are to make the most of the more than 11 million acres of forests that cover our state, intensive research efforts will be required:

Efforts to improve the kinds of trees being grown and to improve their growth rates.

Efforts to more adequately protect our forests from fire, pests, disease, and other destructive forces.

Efforts to more economically harvest and process our timber.

Efforts to expand the markets for timber products.

And, finally, efforts to fully develop and use the other resources of the forests—fish, game, recreation, and natural beauty.

I am proud of the strides the Forest Service is taking toward meeting these challenges.

As I mentioned, in West Virginia alone the Service operates three research stations.

Let me tell you about some of the work being carried on at these three laboratories.

At Parsons, scientists are conducting research on timber and watershed management. Researchers have found profitable ways to lay out, construct, and maintain logging roads while simultaneously protecting valuable watershed resources.

They have shown that—done carefully— heavy timber cutting can substantially increase water yield without damaging water quality.

Parsons scientists are also searching for ways to rid our streams of pollution so both urban and rural dwellers will always have a clean and continuous water supply.

As timber growing and harvesting techniques are improved, there is a commensurate need to improve the demand for, and the marketing of, forest products. This is the work that is being carried on at the Princeton Products Marketing and Utilization Laboratory.

Princeton, West Virginia, scientists are partly responsible for the resurgence in the use of hardwood flooring, rather than other materials. Other research is aimed at developing a floor-leveling system suitable for use in urban housing renewal projects.

With the cooperation of State and private industry officials, Princeton scientists have assisted in the development of a promising system using wooden posts for highway guardrails. The posts are driven into the ground by a kind of mobile pile-driver. If adopted nationwide, this system will sharply expand the demand for wood, while reducing road construction costs.

Do all these projects sound visionary—far off in the future?

Not at all.

Research done at Princeton contributed greatly to the establishment of a new hardwood veneer plant in that town. This plant employs about 100 persons and purchases some 2 million board-feet of logs annually.

I am sure we will witness similar develop-

ments through the State as a result of Forest Service research.

The third laboratory operated by the Forest Service in the State is the one we have come to dedicate today. Here at Morgantown, scientists are conducting research in the field of forest engineering and in wildlife habitat. There is also a field office here for the Forest Service's State and private forestry program.

In the engineering field, a wide range of studies is underway. They are developing improved methods of transport and handling of primary forest products, and improved methods of utilizing low-grade primary forest products.

One study, already completed, has provided engineering data for redesigning wheeled skidders to obtain greater logging efficiency. This and other engineering advances could save the logging industry millions of dollars annually.

The second activity at this new laboratory is wildlife habitat research. This is the newest function at the lab, but it holds great promise.

Wildlife is a valuable forest resource but experts feel that the State's forests are producing game far below their potential.

The wildlife scientists will be searching for systems of forest management that yield not only the maximum amount of timber but also the optimum game crop.

If the number of deer, turkeys, grouse, squirrels and other game could be increased, it is believed that hunting and all the attendant demands for hunter service industries also will increase.

Finally, to be of maximum benefit, research discoveries must be applied in private industry. The staff of the State and private

forestry program must work to keep open the lines of communication between researchers and industry officials.

Briefly, then, these have been, and will be, some of the activities of the three Forest Service laboratories in West Virginia.

I know the work being done at these three laboratories will insure continued healthy forest growth. I am firmly convinced that research being carried on at these laboratories will keep our State's forest products industries economical and viable for years to come. I wish to commend the U.S. Forest Service for its fine work in the past and I know this will continue in the future.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, September 26, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate September 25, 1967.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Damon J. Keith, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Thomas P. Thornton, retired.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued September 27, 1967
For actions of September 26, 1967
90th-1st; No. 152

CONTENTS

Appalachia.....12	Foreign aid.....1	Recreation.....6,21,27
Appropriations..5,18,35,48	Grain.....39	Regional development.....2
CCC.....13	Holidays.....36	Research.....23
Cigarettes.....30	Housing.....26	Rural development.....3
Cosponsors.....10	Hunger.....15,44	Rural fires.....10
County agents.....20	Lands.....26	Ryukyu Islands.....46
Dairy imports.....29	Marine sanctuaries.....34	Social security.....7,37
Data processing.....38	Meat inspection.....10	Spending.....9,17
Economy.....17	Military construction...13	Taxation.....17,24,28,30
Eskildsen.....14	Mink imports.....31	Textile imports.....25
Extension service.....4	Opinion poll.....19	Trade policy.....43
Farm Bureau.....22	Patents.....41	Transportation.....11,47
Fish imports.....33	Personnel.....14,40	World hunger.....15
Flood insurance.....32	Pollution.....8,42	
Food.....15,44	Poverty.....2,16	

SENATE

1. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received the President's message recommending U. S. contribution of up to \$200 million over the next 4 years to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank; to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Banking and Currency Committee (H. Doc. 171). pp. S13593-4, H12442-3
Several Sens. and Reps. debated the merits of the President's message on the Asian Development Bank. pp. S13674, S13678, S13697-8, S13709-10, H12443-4, H12444-5

2. POVERTY. Continued debate on S. 2388, proposed Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967. pp. S13704-8, S13716-33

Sen. Mondale inserted testimony by Sen. Nelson in which he urged the expansion and continuation of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Development Commission and the projects carried forth under this program. pp. S13688-90

Sen. McGee inserted a resolution in support of the poverty program. p. S13675

3. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Sens. Mondale and Harris spoke in favor of the proposed Rural Job Development Act of 1967 in an effort to "slow the present migration of rural people to our large cities," and inserted several articles in support of this measure. pp. S13686, S13688

4. EXTENSION SERVICE. Sen. Morse inserted his testimony on S. 2105, to establish cooperative extension services in D. C., in which he urged a modification of the present bill to eliminate the need of approval by the D. C. Government and designate the Federal City College to carry out this program instead of Howard University. pp. S13713-5

5. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 10345, appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies (S. Rept. 571). p. S13595

Received a report from the Budget Bureau stating that the appropriation to this Department for "Forest protection and utilization," Forest Service, for 1968, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Appropriations Committee. p. S13595

6. RECREATION. Sen. Moss inserted a letter in support of his bill S. 25, to create the Great Salt Lake National Monument, which is now pending in the House. p. S13673

7. SOCIAL SECURITY. Sen. Javits inserted his testimony on H. R. 12080, the proposed Social Security Amendments, in which he urged an expansion of the program above the House-passed version. pp. S13681-3

8. POLLUTION. Sen. Boggs commended the Post Office Department for "the extensive air and water pollution control program which will be undertaken in post offices around the country." pp. S13685-6

Sen. Bayh inserted an article, "Water and Air Pollution--An Industry Responsibility." pp. S13696-7

9. SPENDING. Sen. Proxmire criticized the rate of return on government spending and inserted testimony, "On the Appropriate Discount Rate For Evaluation of Public Projects." pp. S13692-6

10. COSPONSORS. The following cosponsors were added to various bills: Sen. Metcalf to S. 2263, the proposed Cooperative Rural Fire Protection Act; Sen. Hart to S. 2415, the proposed Marine Sanctuaries Study Act of 1967; and Sen. Tydings to S. 2218, to amend the Meat Inspection Act, to provide for cooperation with appropriate State agencies with respect to State meat inspection programs. p. S13598

The move may end a ten-year conflict over freeways in Baltimore and promises to resolve similar hassles in major cities.

The team also will seek ways to use freeway construction to create new housing, community centers and parks along the route and to enhance the city in general.

A Transportation Department spokesman added that while the cheapest way to bring a freeway into the city "is just to go crashing through," it is actually more expensive—socially and otherwise in the long run.

Other cities, notably Washington, Detroit, Chicago, San Francisco and New Orleans, are sure to press the Department of Transportation for money to finance a similar approach.

Transportation and the Bureau of Public Roads are likely to respond favorably because in these and other cities the 11-year-old, \$51-billion Interstate Highway program due to be completed in 1972, is badly stuck.

The Federal Government pays 90 per cent of the cost of interstate highways. As long as 41,000 miles were built out in the open country and highways in the city were routed through deteriorating industrial areas and Negro slums, the program ran relatively smoothly.

But as the freeways were poised at the expensive downtown centers and white residential areas, trouble began to mount. Many mayors and city planners now say that reckless freeway construction contributes to the urban crisis, because freeways often displace more low-income people than urban renewal without paying relocation costs.

For these reasons San Francisco, for instance, shocked by the ugly elevated freeway that cuts off Market Street from the Bay, resisted the 90 per cent Federal carrot and refused to build any more downtown freeways.

DELAY IN WASHINGTON

In Washington, citizen opposition continues to delay construction of the North Central Freeway. A new, comprehensive design approach, such as now approved for Baltimore, planners say, might overcome much opposition by providing low-income "air-rights" housing for displaced people and save such neighborhoods as Brookland and Takoma Park.

Walter Washington, this city's new "mayor," is known to favor such an approach.

The Baltimore design concept was first proposed by architect Archibald C. Rogers and other architects when it was apparent that the freeway program was halted by a bitter controversy.

Maryland State Highway director Jerome B. Wolff responded favorably to the idea. Formation of a design team was delayed because several Baltimore engineering firms objected to placing architects in charge.

OWINGS IN CHARGE

With their objections overcome, architect Nathaniel Owings of San Francisco, who also is redesigning Washington's Mall and Pennsylvania Avenue, has been put in charge.

Under his direction, Transportation Secretary Alan S. Boyd said yesterday, Baltimore will be the first city where "all of the environmental skills available will be brought to bear on the design of a highway from the very beginning."

"With early planning consideration of the highway's social, economic, historic and functional impact," he added, "this will become not just a road through the city but an integral part of the city."

Boyd predicted it "may well set a pattern for designing urban highways across the Nation."

The Interstate system within Baltimore's city limits consists of 23.9 miles and includes Interstate 83, 95 and 70N.

Owings' team will consider the location as well as the development potential of these highways. It also will study the city's mass

transit and commercial transportation problems. The work is expected to take two years.

RESTORATION OF HISTORICAL BUILDINGS IN ST. MARY'S CITY, MD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, Maryland is a State fortunately endowed with many landmarks of interest to the tourist. Many are important to the history of the State and of the Nation.

One such place is St. Mary's City, the first settlement in the State of Maryland. It was founded in 1634. In 1934, the Maryland Tercentenary Commission undertook an accurate restoration of several of the buildings in St. Mary's City.

In 1966, a permanent commission was created to undertake a larger and more general restoration and preservation project in St. Mary's City. At present, this commission, known as the St. Mary's City Commission, is actively seeking both Federal and State funds for land purchase and other capital improvements. The very able chairman of the commission is Gen. Robert E. Hogaboom, a retired marine.

On Sunday, September 22, 1967, the Baltimore Sun published a feature article by Earl Arnett detailing the activities of the St. Mary's City Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. MARYS CITY—ONE OF THOSE QUIET PLACES

(By Earl Arnett)

St. Marys City in southern Maryland is one of those quiet places with loud significance often overlooked in an age where exaggeration and overstatement seem the rule. The first capital of the State, it is one of the first places in the world where religious toleration was a recognized principle backed both by gubernatorial desire, and by legislation.

Even the countryside seems conducive to the peacefulness one associates with tolerance. Its beauty is subdued, a mixture of smooth, silvery-blue water, rolling fields, trees and views across the St. Marys River, where the land on the other side is sometimes hazy and almost mysterious. Because of a benevolent providence the atmosphere has not been tainted with beer cans and honky tonks, but is much the same as when the first Marylanders built there in 1634.

The only tangible evidence of their efforts now are two Seventeenth Century buildings called Clocker's Fancy and Leigh House, and the reconstructed brick State House built by the Maryland Tercentenary Commission of 1934. On the second floor of the latter building are the offices of yet another commission dedicated to the "preservation and development of historic St. Marys City."

TO CELEBRATE HISTORY

This group, called St. Marys City Commission, composed of seven members and a two-man staff, also has a history. It began with the Tercentenary Commission, which was established by the General Assembly and appointed by Governor Albert C. Ritchie to celebrate the 300-year history of Maryland. After the celebration another commission was appointed to supervise the reconstructed State House and its small grounds in St. Marys City.

In its outline plan, the present commis-

sion characterizes the period from 1934 to 1965 as follows: "In time this Commission became inactive, and the affairs of the memorial fell into the hands of the caretaker who, with little financial support and a mere retainer fee, faithfully cared for the building and the grounds." The caretaker was John Lancaster, now retired, who was convinced that the city would become "another Williamsburg."

In 1965 another commission, created by the Legislature and headed by Senator Louise Gore, (R., Montgomery county) worked for twelve months "to study the desirability and feasibility of restoring historic St. Marys City." This interim commission recommended the present permanent commission which was created in 1966. Thus the present commission is the fourth since 1934. To date, it has not recommended the establishment of another commission.

BEYOND 1985

Gen. Robert E. Hogaboom, a retired marine, is the chairman of the St. Marys City Commission. He and his group submitted an outline last March which called for a master plan and divided efforts to preserve and restore St. Marys City into phases, projected from the present to 1985 and beyond. This year, according to the general, the commission has asked for about \$180,000 for "capital improvements," of which \$120,000 is for the acquisition of land.

Most of the land on which the historic city is located is divided among about twenty private owners. The commission wants to buy "about 700 acres immediately," and General Hogaboom estimates that the cost will be well over a million dollars.

The general says that the commission is "actively seeking Federal money, gifts and grants" to help finance development efforts. It is his personal position that the State has "a real obligation" to acquire the land and that grants should be obtained to finance research and reconstruction.

General Hogaboom foresees that the "gradual development of St. Marys City will extend over a period of 50 years." He estimates that it will take several years for historians, archaeologists and architects to determine exactly where original buildings were located, to reconstruct their plans and to stabilize the foundations. But he says that after preliminaries, "within the next ten years Maryland should have one of the most beautiful historical districts in the country to visit."

ONE SERIOUS MISTAKE

The chairman of the commission speaks with enthusiasm and obvious dedication about excavations, land purchases, research and mistakes in other attempts to restore early American towns. He believes, for example, that Williamsburg made "one very serious mistake" by thinking "only in terms of the historic area to be preserved" and not in adjoining areas where thousands of visitors would have to be accommodated and where "life is going to carry on."

But some members of the commission and others interested in the development of St. Marys county like Arthur, known as Buck, Briscoe, chairman of the county's Economic Development Commission, are concerned about the pace of the commission's efforts. They are not confident that the State will always support such a project and are not sure that St. Marys City should become another Williamsburg.

Such people place particular importance on the establishment of what the commission's outline plan labels "an appropriate shrine commemorative of peace and religious tolerance." Preliminary steps have already been taken toward a design for such a memorial. Its proponents believe that it will emphasize the genuine significance of the city as the first place in the New World where religious tolerance was both practiced and made into law.

ASSURANCE OF TOLERATION

Historical records indicate that many of the colonists who first came to Maryland did so out of a desire to worship in their own manner. In 1678 Charles Calvert, third Lord Baltimore, wrote that if the colonists had not had some assurance that toleration would be established by law, "in all probability this province had never been planted."

Before the first colonists left England in 1634, the second Lord Baltimore instructed his brother, Leonard Calvert, that to preserve harmony among the passengers of the Ark and the Dove, Catholics should worship as privately as possible, should not engage in religious discussions and should treat the Protestants with justice.

Religious toleration was a practice in St. Marys City, but the colony's assembly resolved in 1649 to make the practice law. The result was the Act Concerning Religion, sometimes known as the Toleration Act. Part of that act read as follows:

"... that noe person or psons whatsoever within this Province, or the Islands, Ports, Harbors, Creekes, or havens thereunto belonging professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth bee any waies troubled, Molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion nor in the free exercies thereof within this Province or the Islands thereunto belonging nor any way compelled to the beleife or exercise of any other Religion against his or her consent, soe as they be not unfaithfull to the Lord Proprietary, or molest or conspire against the civil Government established or to bee established in this Province vnder him or his heires."

SOMETHING EXTRAORDINARY

That act was later to be repealed, to be reenacted and to endure all the vagaries to which such laws are subject. But when one considers the date of the legislation and the general state of religious tolerance in Europe, one begins to recognize that the colonists in little St. Marys City had done something extraordinary.

And yet even now the city has not been declared a national historic site, a fact General Hogaboom labels "beyond my comprehension."

Thus it would appear that, in St. Marys City, Maryland has not only the remains of a Seventeenth Century city, the third oldest continuous settlement in British America, but the significant beginning of something more intangible and perhaps more valuable—freedom of religion. It is not surprising that some declare this city has a legitimate claim to national and international significance.

One would hope that those responsible for the "preservation and development" of the historic city will give due and creative consideration to this achievement of the spirit.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, it is my understanding that we are to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] not later than 2:30.

If there are any Senators who wish to discuss that amendment, I will be happy to yield to them. If not, and I see no one asking for recognition, I wish to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania, who

desires to speak in connection with another aspect of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank my senior colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I rise in support of title II of the pending measure, the proposed Emergency Employment Act. Title II would authorize \$2.5 billion in financial assistance to public and private agencies, during fiscal years 1968 and 1969, to provide jobs for poor residents of slum ghettos and economically distressed rural areas. Effectively implemented and administered, this program could put a half million people to work within the next 2 years in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development and beautification. Most of the people which this emergency program seeks to help are those who, because of inadequate education and work experience, have been unable to obtain work.

There is a demonstrably urgent need for this program. According to a series of intensive surveys made for the Department of Labor in November 1966, nearly 1 year ago, the unemployment rate in slum areas of eight cities, including Philadelphia in my own Commonwealth, was about 10 percent, almost three times the national average. These figures were based on the traditional statistical concept of unemployment utilized by the Department of Labor. Under a more realistic subemployment measure, the rate for the Nation as a whole was 33.9 percent. In more meaningful terms, nearly one out of three slum residents is either out of work entirely, is working seasonally, or only part time, or has a job paying wages below the generally accepted poverty level of \$3,000.

The North Philadelphia depressed area has the dubious distinction of having an unemployment rate that exceeds the average of the seven other cities surveyed by the Department of Labor. Using the traditional index, 13.2 percent of the 98,592 residents of North Philadelphia are unemployed. Under the more realistic subemployment index, the rate is 34.2 percent.

Citing these and other statistics in a wire to me on September 21, the very able and compassionate district attorney of Philadelphia, Arlen Specter, termed them "almost overwhelming." In view of Mr. Specter's firsthand and intimate knowledge of Philadelphia's slums, I believe it is appropriate at this point in my remarks to read his telegram in its entirety.

District Attorney Specter says as follows:

As a fellow Philadelphian I know you share my deep concern for the welfare of our city. Some of the unemployment statistics, however, are almost overwhelming. For example, estimates are that nearly 66,000 Negroes are unemployed and another 200,000 earn less than \$60 a week. A report by U.S. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz last year put Philadelphia's combined unemployment and subemployment total in the Philadelphia slums at a startling 45 percent. In March of this year another survey by U.S. Secretary of La-

bor Willard Wirtz estimated unemployment among non-whites in Philadelphia between the ages of 14 and 19 at 36-40 percent.

It is not possible for our urban centers to pull themselves up by their bootstraps without the assistance of the Federal Government. The longer we postpone the prescription the worse the disease and decay will become.

I consider it vital for the health and stability of Philadelphia for the U.S. Senate to approve S. 2388 as reported out of Committee. This bill provides \$2.25 billion to continue programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity for the next two years. It also calls for a special appropriation of \$2.5 billion for emergency employment in slum areas in such fields as health, recreation, education and beautification.

This special employment program would make available 200,000 new jobs in 1968 for the unemployed of which Philadelphia's share should be several thousand.

Approval of S. 2388 will provide funds for needed jobs in the slums, expansion of the Day Care Program, a small business and technical assistance program, help for the migrant workers, an expanded VISTA program, and assistance for the rehabilitation of slum areas.

We must have increased Federal assistance if we are to get Philadelphia moving towards a solution of its problems while the innovative proposals and administration of the projects should be left in the hands of local people who have firsthand knowledge of the problems. The funds for these efforts simply must come from the Federal Government. S. 2388 is a strong step towards providing the increased appropriations we need and I hope you will give it your strong support.

Several factors account for these shockingly high rates of unemployment in our big cities and in certain rural areas: inadequate education, lack of job skills, police records, racial discrimination, broken homes, narcotics addiction, and despair. However, as Dr. Harold L. Sheppard pointed out in a study for the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, which is chaired by my colleague from Pennsylvania:

Inadequate and inferior education and training are obviously the deep, underlying elements in this situation.

The evidence is clear, Mr. President. A significant percentage of residents of city slums and rural areas are either out of work or, because of their personal situations, have jobs which pay poverty wages. This is an undeniable fact despite the low nationwide unemployment rate.

Compassion for our fellow citizens impels us, in my opinion, to offer a helping hand. These persons need a chance for meaningful work.

Now, Mr. President, I am fully conscious of the limitations and imperfections of the proposed Emergency Employment Act. But the shocking evidence adduced by recent Labor Department surveys and my recent firsthand look at life in some of the ghettos in my Commonwealth have convinced me of the urgent need for an emergency program along the lines of title II of the pending bill.

While supporting title II, I want to make it unmistakably clear, Mr. President, that I do not regard it as a panacea. Considering the desperate straits of the hard-core unemployed, I realize that this program will not, in many instances, lead to the maximum of self-support and eco-

conomic independence. But, Mr. President, we have a chance to create 200,000 jobs in the present fiscal year. Compare this figure with the results of all the federally supported manpower programs enacted over the past 6 years. In mid-1967, 290,000 people were enrolled in these several and varied programs. Even this proposed Emergency Employment Act is designed to reach only 500,000 persons in two years, almost one-sixth of the potential clientele for public service employment programs.

Properly conceived and implemented, this program can result in meaningful employment opportunities. This is especially true if private enterprise is permitted significant participation. I would like to see title II clarified in this respect, Mr. President. Accordingly, I am drafting an amendment which I may offer if the appropriate occasion presents itself later this week. One cannot expect private employers to rush forward to offer jobs to people without the requisite skills. The cost of rehabilitating these persons and providing them with needed supportive services prevents private employers from hiring them. I would like to see title II provide appropriate incentives to encourage private employers to hire the hard-core unemployed. I believe that this is one of the implicit intents of title II, but I hope to spell it out in the amendment which I am preparing. The Manpower Development and Training Act and the out-of-school phase of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program serve as precedents for such incentives. By permitting significant private enterprise participation, we can, I believe, avert the possibility that this emergency employment program will consist mostly of make work projects.

It would be unrealistic to expect this emergency program to bring economic independence to every one of its beneficiaries. Not everyone will be hired by private employers for vocational rehabilitation and development. Faced with the alternative of complete deprivation or continued living on the dole, I would prefer to see these disadvantaged people given a chance to perform meaningful and socially useful work commensurate with their ability and skill.

One virtue of the program proposed in title II is its flexibility. It recognizes the heterogeneous character of the people to be helped and their situations. Its application in certain rural areas, particularly in the South, can help to stem the migration to our congested big cities in the North. One hundred thousand technologically displaced Mississippi farmworkers represent a target of opportunity. Teenage high school students participating in the program would have a hopeful alternative to dropping out of school. I cite a revealing study of the in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps in Pittsburgh, Pa. During the 1965-66 school year, the dropout rate for students in Pittsburgh's 16 high schools not enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps doubled that of New York City enrollees—8.4 percent for non-New York City enrollees as against 4.24 percent for New York City enrollees. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this study—

"Neighborhood Youth Corps: Holding Power Study," performed by the division of occupational, vocational, and technical education of the Pittsburgh public schools, and published in May 1967—be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the important thing to bear in mind here, Mr. President, is that the Emergency Employment Act is a stopgap measure. It is not a substitute for existing manpower programs or for programs contemplating more effective, long-range remedies for the present plight of disadvantaged but employable urban slum and rural residents.

In view of the plight of the hard-core unemployed, I find it difficult to understand the attitude of the Johnson administration. The contrast between promise and performance has been one of the hallmarks of the Great Society, Mr. President, but it was never as evident as it is now.

In his state of the Union message almost 4 years ago, President Johnson declared an all-out war against poverty and followed this up with frequent rhetorical ruffles and flourishes. Advisory exhortations and a raft of legislative proposals bearing the Great Society label encouraged rapidly rising expectations. Yet, Mr. President, the trickle-down effect which is the gap between promise and performance remains wide as far as several million urban and rural slum dwellers are concerned.

Of course, the pastime downtown is to blame this situation on Congress. While we are not blameless, Mr. President, I think it is fair to say the administration has not been utilizing its weapons as effectively as it could, nor has it been willing to consider all the alternatives that have been proposed. One such alternative, the Human Investment Act, of which I am proud to be a sponsor, is languishing in committee because of adamant administration opposition. Here we have a sort of reverse Pavlovian reaction to anything offered from the minority side. This measure could result in the meaningful involvement of private enterprise in the Government's manpower training and development programs.

In the aftermath of the Detroit riots, President Johnson declared: "Our work has just begun."

Instead of accelerating efforts to alleviate the most immediately desperate conditions in our big city slums and other deprived areas, this administration has seen fit to rest on the laurels of the last Congress, oppose constructive alternatives like the Human Investment Act, and try to sabotage the efforts of members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to report to the Senate the Emergency Employment Act.

I indicated earlier that the proposed act has its limitations and imperfections. One reason why this is so, I suspect, is that the administration refused to lend a hand in drafting it.

I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate's debate on this measure will im-

part to the White House the sense of urgency many of us feel here.

In closing, Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the price tag of the Emergency Employment Act—\$1 billion for the current fiscal year in the face of a projected deficit, without a tax increase, of \$30 billion. I am supporting this measure in full awareness of my feeling that an earnest effort to reduce or defer unnecessary expenditures must be made if we are to give serious consideration to the President's tax surcharge proposal.

Let me point out, however, that the livelihood and well-being of needy people are at stake here. Are we going to give them a chance to get out of their present plight, Mr. President? Their needs are more urgent than those of a few operators of large farms who receive Federal subsidies or candidates for office who stand to benefit from the proposed campaign subsidy recently reported to the Senate. What we do to alleviate their plight is far more important than the race to the moon. We are talking here about human life which, in the last analysis, is more important than conjured dreams of national prestige.

And so, Mr. President, recognizing the imperfections of title II and its costs, but weighing them against the potential benefits of the program and the dangerous consequence of inaction, I support title II and urge its retention in the pending bill.

EXHIBIT 1

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS: HOLDING POWER STUDY, SCHOOL YEAR 1965-66

(By the Division of Occupational, Vocational, and Technical Education, Pittsburgh Public Schools, May 1967)

THE STUDY

The section of the Economic Opportunity Act authorizing the establishment of the Neighborhood Youth Corps states: "The purpose of this part is to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed young men and women, through participation in State and Community work-training programs, so that their employability may be increased or their education resumed or continued . . ."

This study was undertaken to determine whether there is any tangible evidence to indicate that the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program as it has been operating in the Pittsburgh Public Schools is making possible the continuation of the education of its enrollees, and thereby fulfilling in part the purpose for which the Corps was established.

The dropout rate for NYC enrollees was compared with the dropout rate for Non-NYC students in each of the sixteen high schools. Junior High School students were not included in this study since only seven were identified. The three vocational-technical high schools were included although their statistics were not entirely compatible with those of the other high schools.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees from the Summer 1965 and In-School 1965-66 programs were included in this study so as to harmonize with the period of time covered by *A Study of School Holding Power, School Year 1965-66*, from which statistics were taken, and with which comparisons were made. All post graduates were eliminated because they could no longer be dropouts. The study was complicated by the mobility of the enrollees; frequently students enrolled in one school worked out of another NYC center. As work was completed, enrollees were shifted to other centers: one enrollee attended a given high school and worked

out of four different NYC centers. This was particularly true for the Summer program and necessitated a great deal of cross-checking.

By utilizing the NYC files and *A Study of School Holding Power, School Year 1965-66*, it was possible to conduct this study without imposing on the time of clerks and counselors in the various schools. Clerks and counselors were contacted only when clarification was needed to insure the accuracy of the study.

THE PROBLEM

It must be realized from the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act that every NYC enrollee is a potential dropout. First, the minimum enrollment age (sixteen) is also the legal dropout age for employment in Pennsylvania; second, the low family income required for admission into the NYC makes full time employment with its correspondingly higher income very tempting to the student and to his family; third, the low socio-economic level from which NYC enrollees must of necessity come limits the aspirations and possibilities for college attendance and thereby reduces the desire and need for high school graduation. We might, therefore, anticipate a higher dropout rate for NYC enrollees than for Non-NYC students.

Since enrollees were continually admitted through both the Summer and the In-School programs, even rolls which were alphabetized with the starting group ceased to be such as additional students entered. This required the alphabetizing for each program and then the merging of the rolls for each of the sixteen high schools. Since these rolls indicated only the center out of which the student worked, it was necessary to search the files for each of roughly 2500 enrollees to determine the school which he attended and in

order to eliminate all post graduates. Names on the final NYC roll for each school were compared with those sent in by the individual high schools for the holding power study in order to identify NYC enrollees who had dropped out of school.

RESULTS

Contrary to what might have been expected, the dropout rate for Non-NYC students was almost twice as great as for the NYC enrollees. Of a total enrollment of 20,941 for all schools there were 2,077 enrollees on NYC. The dropout rate for Non-NYC students for all schools was 8.43%; the dropout rate for NYC enrollees was 4.24%.

In only two schools was the dropout rate slightly higher for NYC enrollees, Alderdice, 1.32% higher and Connelley, 0.6% higher. In contrast, the dropout rate for Non-NYC students in Fifth was 13.01% higher than for NYC enrollees and for Oliver the Non-NYC dropout rate was 17.05% higher than for NYC enrollees. As indicated by the graph on Page 7, the difference in the dropout rates varies inversely with the holding power of the school as determined in *A Study of School Holding Power, School Year 1965-66*. Alderdice with a holding power of 94.1% has a dropout rate difference of -1.32% while Oliver with a 54.0% holding power has a dropout rate difference of 17.05%, and Fifth which has the lowest holding power, 47.5%, has a dropout rate difference of 13.01%.

This graph also indicates the ratio of NYC enrollees in percentages of the total enrollment for each school. It will be noted that the schools with the greatest holding power have the fewest NYC enrollees giving further evidence of the effects of the socio-economic factor to which previous reference was made. It can be seen that with one exception, the vocational-technical schools, Arsenal, Con-

nelley and Washington, do not conform to the general pattern of the graph. These points are identified on the curve by circled dots.

Individual Dropout Statistics on pages 8, 9, and 10 indicate the school attended, age, grade, number of hours worked and reason for dropping out for each NYC enrollee. Of the 2,077 enrollees in the two programs there were 88 dropouts as against 18,864 Non-NYC students who had a total of 1,590 dropouts.

The Collective NYC Dropout Statistics on page 11 show that well over half of the girls dropped out for marriage and medical excuses with only two dropping out for employment. Even with the high rate of employment, one-half of the dropouts were overage and had no prospects of immediate employment.

The median dropout age fell in the 17-7 to 18-0 range with the median grade level 11th grade. This means that the average dropout was retarded a minimum of one year.

One-eighth of the enrollees who dropped out worked less than 25 hours, one-fourth worked less than 50 hours and almost one-half worked less than 100 hours.

This study has indicated that for the school year 1965-66 the NYC enrollees in the Pittsburgh Public Schools were enabled to continue their education and had a dropout rate about one-half as great as students not on NYC, most of whom, at least economically, were more favorably situated. To this degree the program was successful in fulfilling the purpose for which it was established.

While no effort was made to examine the reason for this retention, it is possible that the close contact between enrollee and NYC counselor has brought a better understanding of the need of continued educational preparation and that the additional income made staying in school a possibility for the enrollee.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS HOLDING POWER STUDY,¹ PITTSBURGH PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1965-66

School	Grades 9, 10, 11, 12 enrollment	NYC enrollees ²	Net enrollment	Percent of students on NYC	Non-NYC drop-outs	NYC drop-outs	Percent drop-outs non-NYC	Percent drop-out NYC
Alderdice.....	2,398	72	2,326	3.01	34	2	1.46	2.78
Allegheny.....	1,066	184	882	17.26	134	9	15.1	4.89
Arsenal.....	408	35	373	8.58	33	1	8.85	2.86
Carrick.....	1,152	79	1,073	6.86	65	2	6.06	2.53
Connelley.....	626	69	557	11.02	85	11	15.3	15.9
Fifth Avenue.....	976	177	799	18.14	131	6	16.4	3.39
Gladstone.....	600	140	460	23.33	57	7	12.4	5.00
Langley.....	1,404	199	1,285	8.48	75	3	5.84	2.52
Oliver.....	855	162	693	18.95	131	3	18.9	1.85
Peabody.....	2,293	132	2,161	5.76	132	6	6.11	4.55
Perry.....	1,314	126	1,188	9.59	85	5	7.15	3.97
Schenley.....	1,757	216	1,541	12.29	209	8	13.56	3.70
South.....	1,427	180	1,247	21.61	134	11	10.68	6.67
South Hills.....	2,291	141	2,150	6.15	140	8	6.51	5.67
Washington.....	469	61	408	13.01	25	1	6.13	1.64
Westinghouse.....	1,905	184	1,721	9.66	120	5	6.97	2.72
Total.....	20,941	2,077	18,864	9.92	1,590	88	8.43	4.24

¹ School enrollment and dropouts from "A Study of School Holding Power, School Year 1965-66," using grades 9, 10, 11, and 12.

² NYC enrollment from NYC files covering summer program, June 28, 1965, to Sept. 3, 1965, and in-school program, Sept. 16, 1965, to June 24, 1966. All postgraduates were eliminated from calculations.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS HOLDING POWER STUDY¹

[In percent]

School	Holding power	Difference between non-NYC and NYC dropout rates ²
Alderdice.....	94.1	-1.32
Washington.....	86.3	4.49
Carrick.....	78.9	3.53
Langley.....	78.2	3.32
South Hills.....	78.1	.84
Peabody.....	77.9	1.56
Westinghouse.....	74.1	4.25
Perry.....	72.2	3.18
Arsenal.....	70.8	5.99
Allegheny.....	65.0	10.21
South.....	63.6	4.01
Connelley.....	61.0	-.60
Schenley.....	59.1	9.86
Gladstone.....	54.3	7.40
Oliver.....	54.0	17.05
Fifth.....	47.5	13.01

¹ Holding power from "A Study of School Holding Power, School Year 1965-66."

² The overall dropout rate for non-NYC students is 4.19 percent higher than for NYC students.

Only Alderdice which has the greatest holding power and Connelley have slightly higher dropout rates for NYC. Oliver shows 17.05 percent higher dropout rate for non-NYC enrollees.

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS HOLDING POWER STUDY—INDIVIDUAL NYC DROPOUT STATISTICS

School	Enrollee	Age		Sex	Grade	Hours worked in NYC	Reason	School	Enrollee	Age		Sex	Grade	Hours worked in NYC	Reason
		Years	Months							Years	Months				
Allerdice-----	1	16	5	M	10	66	Employment.	Peabody-----	1	17	4	M	10	128½	Overage.
	2	18	0	M	12	57	Do.		2	17	0	F	12	96	Married.
Allegheny-----	1	17	1	M	11	188	Armed Forces.		3	17	5	M	11	4	Overage.
	2	16	7	F	11	6	Medical excuse.		4	17	4	F	12	97	Medical excuse.
	3	17	3	F	11	125½	Do.		5	17	0	M	12	120	Overage.
	4	17	5	F	11	105	Employment.		6	17	8	M	12	90	Do.
	5	19	9	M	12	326	Do.	Perry-----	1	19	5	F	11	230	Medical excuse.
	6	17	0	M	11	30	Armed Forces.		2	16	6	M	10	31	Employment.
	7	18	1	M	11	264	Overage.		3	17	8	M	11	269	Overage.
	8	18	3	M	12	221	Employment.		4	18	2	F	12	29	Married.
	9	18	2	F	12	121	Overage.		5	17	9	F	10	96	Do.
Arsenal-----	1	17	11	F	12	120	Do.	Schenley-----	1	17	0	M	11	295	Overage.
Carrick-----	1	17	6	F	12	190	Married.		2	18	7	M	(1)	40	Do.
	2	16	8	F	11	28	Medical excuse.		3	19	0	M	12	30	Do.
Connelley-----	1	18	1	M	12	137	Armed Forces.		4	17	0	M	12	120	Do.
	2	20	2	M	11	410	Overage.		5	17	0	M	11	168	Do.
	3	17	0	M	10	123	Do.		6	17	10	F	12	449	Married.
	4	17	11	M	12	225	Do.		7	16	9	M	(1)	248	Employment.
	5	17	5	M	11	221	Employment.		8	17	7	F	11	199	Overage.
	6	17	1	M	10	7	Armed Forces.	South-----	1	17	10	M	10	211	Do.
	7	17	5	M	10	120	Overage.		2	18	9	F	12	14	Medical excuse.
	8	18	9	M	12	96	Discipline.		3	17	9	M	11	9	Overage.
	9	17	0	M	10	290	Overage.		4	17	10	M	10	88	Employment.
	10	17	5	M	10	365	Do.		5	17	0	M	11	39	Armed Forces.
Fifth-----	11	17	5	M	10	318	Armed Forces.		6	17	9	F	11	94	Overage.
	2	18	6	F	12	346	Overage.		7	16	9	M	10	21	Employment.
	3	18	4	M	9	151	Medical excuse.		8	19	6	M	11	283	Armed Forces.
	4	18	11	F	11	361	Employment.		9	17	5	M	12	297	Overage.
	5	19	6	M	12	163	Overage.		10	18	4	M	11	5	Employment.
	6	18	4	F	12	288	Do.	South Hills-----	11	16	8	F	11	56	Medical excuse.
Gladstone-----	1	17	7	M	11	124	Do.		1	18	2	M	12	4	Employment.
	2	18	1	F	11	9	Do.		2	17	10	M	12	153	Do.
	3	18	9	F	12	145	Employment.		3	16	10	M	11	15	Overage.
	4	16	1	F	10	130	Married.		4	17	7	M	12	26	Do.
	5	17	4	M	10	47	Do.		5	18	10	M	11	64	Employment.
	6	17	2	M	9	278	Overage.		6	17	3	M	11	298	Armed Forces.
	7	17	1	M	11	3	Do.		7	17	11	F	12	77	Married.
Langley-----	1	16	9	M	9	118	Do.		8	17	5	M	12	288	Employment.
	2	17	9	F	10	320	Job Corps.	Washington-----	1	17	11	M	11	260	Armed Forces.
	3	17	0	M	10	52	Overage.	Westinghouse-----	1	20	1	M	12	218	Overage.
Oliver-----	1	17	10	M	12	72	Do.		2	16	11	F	11	237	Medical excuse.
	2	18	6	F	11	263	Do.		3	17	6	M	9	164	Overage.
	3	17	9	F	10	56	Do.		4	18	8	M	12	314	Do.
						45	Do.		5	17	10	M	10	81	Do.

¹ Special.

Collective Neighborhood Youth Corps Dropout Statistics

REASONS FOR DROPOUTS

Male:	
Overage -----	33
Employment -----	15
Armed Forces -----	9
Job Corps -----	1
Disciplinary -----	1

Female:	
Overage -----	10
Medical excuse -----	9
Married -----	8
Employed -----	2

AGE OF DROPOUTS IN YEARS AND MONTHS

16, 1 to 16, 6-----	3
16, 7 to 17, 0-----	18
17, 1 to 17, 6-----	20
17, 7 to 18, 0-----	20
18, 1 to 18, 6-----	13
18, 7 to 19, 0-----	7
19, 1 to 19, 6-----	4
19, 7 to 20, 0-----	1
20, 1 to 20, 6-----	2

GRADE LEVEL OF DROPOUTS

9th -----	4
10th -----	19
11th -----	31
12th -----	32
Special -----	2

HOURS WORKED BY DROPOUTS

	Number
0 to 25 -----	11
26 to 50 -----	10
51 to 75 -----	7
76 to 100 -----	9
101 to 150 -----	14
151 to 200 -----	8
200 to 300 -----	20
Over 300 -----	9

One-eighth of the dropouts worked less than 25 hours.

One-fourth worked less than 50 hours.

Almost one-half worked less than 100 hours.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I want to thank my distinguished colleague [Mr. CLARK] for yielding to me at this time, and to express the hope that title II will be observed realistically, in full awareness of the fact that our investment in people is more important to this Nation's security, its well-being and its ongoing progress than any other project or proposal among the many which the Senate considers.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to have the support of my colleague from Pennsylvania on title II. I am pleased, indeed, that he has taken the position he has.

As he knows, Mayor Tate, of Philadelphia, as the president of the Conference of Mayors has endorsed title II. I am also happy to note that his opponent has also endorsed title II. This gives to Philadelphia the bipartisan support which I am very happy to have in connection with title II of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. I think this is a matter which goes beyond partisanship.

CONSERVATION BUILDS CHARACTER, TOO

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I want to give my vigorous support to the amendment offered by the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee [Mr. JACKSON], on which I have the privilege of serving, directing that 40 percent of Job Corps enrollees be assigned to conservation centers.

There is no area of Job Corps activity in which we have been better able to accomplish the dual objectives of the program: both the rebuilding of young lives toward constructive, useful goals and the accomplishment of useful work in the process.

The most deprived and often rejected youths have been assigned to conservation camps. One would think that they have little time to help others than themselves. But quick recognition of the value to others—to society as a whole—of the tasks performed in the conservation work areas has not only convinced the youth of their own potential worth to society, but it has also convinced many who first opposed this program that it has great merit both for its rehabilitation of the enrollees and for the rehabilitation of deteriorated and wasting resources.

The outstanding contribution of our Job Corps enrollees to the Nation's conservation effort does not tell the whole story of the Job Corps youth and the program. The rest of the story is written in many incidents where these young men have voluntarily and unselfishly given aid to communities in emergencies caused by fires, floods, tornadoes, and similar disasters. They were in the fight against floods in Oregon, California, Colorado, and Nebraska; in tornadoes in Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin and, most recently, in the tragic forest fire disaster in the Northwestern States. These contributions were voluntary and without compensation or special inducement.

These disasters have presented the youth with unusual opportunities to serve their fellowmen, and given them the satisfaction that goes with doing so; but other less spectacular types of conservation work have proven to provide the same sort of satisfaction: visible evidence of betterment of our environment

and the sort of tangible results that allows a person to go to bed at night with a feeling of having accomplished something of value during the day just closed, and having the opportunity to do more of value during the days that follow.

I am particularly pleased with the Job Corps' performance in my own State of South Dakota. We have had the good fortune of having a Job Corps center at Nemo, and expect we will soon have another at Eagle Butte.

In South Dakota, we are grateful for the splendid conservation work that the boys in the center at Nemo have done, and our citizens hope that the program, making a visible constructive contribution to the conservation of both human and natural resources, will be continued with emphasis on the conservation centers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2:30 o'clock p.m. having arrived, the Senate, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, will proceed to vote on amendment No. 324, offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 82, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 266 Leg.]

YEAS—82

Aiken	Byrd, W. Va.	Eastland
Allott	Cannon	Ellender
Anderson	Carlson	Ervin
Bartlett	Church	Fannin
Bayh	Clark	Fong
Bennett	Cooper	Gore
Bible	Cotton	Griffin
Boggs	Curtis	Gruening
Brewster	Dirksen	Hansen
Burdick	Dodd	Harris
Byrd, Va.	Dominick	Hart

Hayden	McGee
Hill	McGovern
Holland	Metcalf
Hollings	Mondale
Inouye	Monroney
Jackson	Montoya
Jordan, N.C.	Morse
Jordan, Idaho	Morton
Kennedy, Mass.	Moss
Kennedy, N.Y.	Mundt
Lausche	Murphy
Long, Mo.	Muskie
Long, La.	Nelson
Magnuson	Pell
Mansfield	Prouty
McCarthy	Proxmire
McClellan	Randolph

NAYS—5

Brooke	Javits	Percy
Case	Miller	

NOT VOTING—13

Baker	Hruska	Smathers
Fulbright	Kuchel	Symington
Hartke	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hatfield	Pastore	
Hickenlooper	Pearson	

So Mr. JACKSON's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INTERVENTION OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS IN CLEVELAND LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on September 13, 1967, I made a statement on this floor asking why the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Gardner Ackley, did not see fit to enter the management-labor dispute about wages in Cleveland between the building contractors and the building craftsmen's union. From that dispute there resulted a 40-percent wage increase over a 3-year period, constituting a tremendous impetus to the cost of living in the general Cleveland area.

Mr. Gardner Ackley wrote to me on September 18, pointing out in his letter that he did intervene. He stated that industrial and labor leaders were cautioned about the damaging impact that a 40-percent increase over a 3-year period in wages would have on the cost of living.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,

Washington, D.C., September 18, 1967.

Hon. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: I have read with interest your comments in the *Congressional Record* for September 13 about the costs of construction in Clermont County, Ohio. I share your concern—and the concern of your constituent, Reverend Carl R. Steinbicker—that increased construction costs may force postponement of the installation of a sewage system in Mt. Repose. More fundamentally and more generally, increased construction costs are damaging our economic health and well-being in a multitude of ways, and with impacts that will be felt for years and years to come. And, as you indicated, it is clear that excessive increases in wages and

fringe benefits have played an important part in increased construction costs.

While I agree with your concern and your diagnosis, I am naturally disturbed by your query as to "why the Federal Government did not intervene through Mr. Ackley while the negotiations were being carried on and through which the labor unions were granted a 40-percent increase in wages over a period of 3 years . . ."

Within the proper limits of the role of the Council of Economic Advisers, I believe that all reasonable efforts have been made to influence construction bargaining, not only in Ohio but elsewhere. In our *Annual Report* of January 1966, the Council discussed the construction cost problem at some length. We said "Construction is clearly an industry that raises serious problems for wage-price stability." In our January 1967 *Report*, we singled out construction settlements as having "consistently and significantly exceeded the general guidepost" for wages.

During 1966, I wrote letters urging cost stability to several Ohio contractors who were involved in labor negotiations and to the representatives of their employees. For example, I enclose a copy of my letter dated April 16, 1966, to Mr. Howard L. Knauf of the Associated General Contractors of America Chapter in Cincinnati. As indicated, copies of my letters to employers were also sent to the local and national leaders of the unions involved.

In spite of the lack of success of my efforts to moderate Ohio settlements in 1966, I continued my efforts in 1967. For example, in the statewide dispute involving the Operating Engineers, I made clear to both parties the concern of the President and his Administration for a reasonable settlement. This dispute was particularly important because it helped establish a pattern of excessive construction wage settlements in Ohio. A copy of my correspondence with the parties in this dispute is included—and I hope that you will agree that my views were presented in an unambiguous fashion.

However, as you doubtless know, my letter appears to have had little effect—the Operating Engineers' five-year contract included a wage increase of more than 50 percent. And it was followed by similarly excessive settlements for other Ohio construction trades.

In a sense, my lack of persuasiveness in the Operating Engineers and similar cases is unfortunate—it would be fine if the Government's views had prevailed, and wages and costs in the construction industry were not spiraling. But in another sense, I believe we would both be uneasy if my views could dominate every settlement. If, through ad hoc procedures or through statutory authority, the Executive Branch had or were given the power to dominate wage settlements in any circumstances short of total war, I imagine you would be one of the first to protest vigorously. And I would support your protest, for I am the veteran of more than six years of price control work during two wars, and I know very well the distortions and inequities which are unavoidable under wage and price control.

I must therefore express my sympathy for the problems of your constituents caused by the recent patterns of wages and costs in construction, and my deep concern for their economic impact. Yet I must also express my unwillingness and inability to intervene in such negotiations to a greater extent than I already have. If the parties in collective bargaining abuse their freedom, I believe the Government may appropriately urge them to accept their responsibilities. And public opinion may well condemn their abuse. But it must not usurp their responsibilities.

There may well be more effective ways for us to educate and to persuade, or for public opinion to be focussed on those who use irresponsibly their market power over wages

by the junior and community college segment of higher education parallels the enlargement of the scope of higher educational services which were brought about by the establishment, through the Morrill Act, of the land-grant system. I therefore sought to join the debate by suggesting, first, the extension to the District of Columbia of the land-grant services through, and this is my second point, a junior and community college mechanism.

Judging from our own hearings before the Senate District of Columbia Committee the nub of the opposition which developed was to the second portion of the proposal. Many in higher education are evidently not yet willing to accept as fully equal in status the junior and community college. This, I feel sure, was part of the reason for the opposition to the proposal.

But in fairness, I am constrained to admit that the hearings developed practical objections on the basis that at least a 4-year institution was necessary to attract and hold the academic personnel needed to perform competently the program desired. This objection carries great weight with me. Therefore, I would urge that your Committee place the responsibility for this program with the public 4-year institution of the District of Columbia, the Federal City College.

Many advantages will flow if you adopt this suggestion. Federal City College is at the threshold of commencing operations. Given this responsibility and the flexibility which is inherent in the beginning of an enterprise, a program such as this can be planned properly and brought into being at the start. Secondly, since Federal City College exists to serve primarily the residents of the District of Columbia whereas Howard University serves a national constituency, it would be my view that Federal City College in administering this program would be able to work more closely with the people of the District of Columbia.

Dr. Paul A. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, testified before my Subcommittee:

"I think the great genius of the Morrill Act to begin with . . . was not that they trained students in agriculture and in home economics in the schools, which were the two main subjects, but that they provided technical services in which the people themselves were involved in setting their own programs, working away at matters which they thought to be important, a process which was reinforced at once by the cooperation of local government, largely counties on the rural side, by state governments, by the state land-grant institutions, and by the Federal Government."

Dr. Miller then went on to say:

"I think that the genius of the land-grant rural movement was that the people really involved themselves. They planned the programs."

He concluded by saying:

"I think health issues, educational problems, matters of family services and community services, all of these are amenable to the approach that has been used in another realm over the last 100 years."

There has been a great deal of criticism in the District of Columbia that Howard University has isolated itself from the activities and the life of the community. This criticism comes from the Negro and white communities.

If the Federal Cooperative Extension Service programs are to be effective, it would seem to me that the college or university would have to cooperate completely with the District of Columbia Welfare Department, the Health Department, the Recreation Department, and the District of Columbia School Board for all of these people would have to be brought into the program to pin-

point problem families and coordinate activities.

During those difficult years in which many of us attempted to get through the Congress a Public Higher Education bill for the District of Columbia, our Committee received no assistance from any official of Howard University. My Subcommittee, which held hearings on the D.C. higher education bill, extended an invitation to the Acting President of Howard University to testify on the legislation, as the presidents of many of the other private institutions of higher learning did. The Acting President of Howard University declined an invitation to testify before the Senate District Committee on the legislation.

One advantage that might be cited for Howard University—that of possessing a graduate capability—on closer inspection is rather, in my opinion, somewhat of a liability in that the programs already established at the graduate level were not formed with the end in view of incorporating the type and kind of service envisaged by the bill.

At this point, I suggest to you that the Committee, should it designate Federal City College as the institution of higher education to carry out this program in the District of Columbia, might wish to express its view to the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the desirability of having the Secretary make available for the purposes of carrying out this program not only the assistance of governmental agencies involved in the Extension Service program, but in addition thereto, to explore the possibilities of making available for the purpose of this program the capabilities of the Graduate School of the Department of Agriculture. If this were done, surely there could be no question but that the authorities of Federal City College would have available to them an unparalleled resource of expertise in this area.

My last point in support of my proposal to substitute Federal City College for Howard University is a practical one and is based in part upon Senate jurisdictional areas. I greatly fear that were Howard University to be given this authority circumstances would arise in the future which would require collective action on the part of at least 3 legislative committees of the Senate and 3 appropriations subcommittees of the Senate. I hesitate to even touch upon the subcommittee jurisdiction which could become involved in the other body.

We all know that in such a situation, it becomes very difficult for members of any of the committees to exercise properly legislative oversight functions.

With 2 legislative committees involved, the problem, by that degree, would be less severe than would be the case if 3 were concerned. As an aid to the Committee, I have asked the Legislative Counsel to prepare amendments to the pending bill which, if adopted, would meet in large part the objections I have raised. I submit them now to the Committee and I request that they appear in the printed hearings record at this point in my remarks.

Thank you.

AMENDMENTS TO S. 2105

On page 2, line 4, beginning with "government," strike out all through the period on line 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Board of Higher Education (established pursuant to title I of the District of Columbia Public Education Act), and shall be covered by a memorandum of understanding agreed to by the aforementioned Board and the Department."

On page 2, line 9, strike out "Howard University" and insert in lieu thereof "Federal City College (established pursuant to the District of Columbia Public Education Act)".

On page 3, strike out lines 3 and 4.

SENATOR PERCY ADDRESSES BROADCAST PIONEERS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last Thursday, our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy], made a very significant speech in Chicago in which he questioned the administration policy of bombing near the borders of China. He warned that such a policy might stimulate vastly increased Chinese military assistance to North Vietnam.

Senator PERCY asked the administration to "rethink" its bombing policy and "hopefully to decide that the limited military gain in bombing near China is not worth the risks involved." He expressed deep concern that our men in Vietnam might be exposed to greater dangers than they face today. He argues that it is imprudent to bomb a rail line within 7 miles of the China border when the same military objective can be served by bombing the railroad much farther from China.

While I do not personally agree with the premise of my distinguished colleague, I think we can all recognize that he has made an important contribution to the continuing dialog on U.S. policy in Vietnam.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD pertinent remarks made by Senator PERCY before a meeting of the Broadcast Pioneers in Chicago on September 21, 1967.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR CHARLES H. PERCY
TO THE BROADCAST PIONEERS, CHICAGO, ILL.,
SEPTEMBER 21, 1967

I would hope that as world events become more complex and relevant to life in this country, Chicago broadcasters—and hopefully all broadcasters—will now take the lead in the area of *interpretive* news. We have learned that no matter how remote a country might be, or how removed the problem might be, the consequences can reach into each of our homes.

Thus, it is increasingly important that broadcasters not only report the news, but analyze and evaluate it as well. At a time when we are immersed in war eleven thousand miles from Chicago, a war which has caused division and dissension throughout the country, we are dramatically reminded that it is not enough simply to accept events as they happen. We are reminded how important it is to interpret events *while* they are happening. It appears that all of us, in public life and in communications, have been too inattentive to events, how else could we find ourselves with over a half million soldiers in Vietnam and still lack a commonly accepted understanding of the extent and purpose of our endeavors.

On of the basic principles of the American system has been that of checks and balances. And one of the most effectively influential of these checks has been the press and the broadcasting industry. Fulfilling this responsibility, the broadcasting industry can help stop excessive and irresponsible actions. Failing this responsibility, the broadcasting industry will be the tacit partner of the government, sharing passively in its successes and acquiescing in its failures.

For example, I would think that broadcasters, just as much as legislators, would now have a responsibility to evaluate the

most recent escalation of the war in Vietnam.

While argument continues between honorable men as to whether we can bring the war to negotiation more quickly by ending the bombing or accelerating the bombing; while patriotic men may still argue whether or not we should have become involved in Vietnam in the first place—I think few men would justify the limited military gain in bombing near the Chinese border considering the tremendous risks involved. Chief among these is the danger of stimulating vastly increased Chinese participation in the North Vietnamese war effort. Thus, bombing so near the perimeter of China could well pull the U.S. into a war many times the scope of the present conflict.

How would we react if Chinese planes were bombing Canada, ten miles from Detroit, or Mexico, minutes from San Diego? War cannot be computerized or 100% controlled. Accidents are a part of war. What shall be the consequences if our bombs accidentally fall on China? We were told that safety precautions were such that we could never lose an atomic bomb. Tell this now to the Spaniards.

Until recently, the Administration refused to bomb any closer than 30 miles from the China border, explaining that to do so would risk overflights which might provoke the Chinese to react militarily against our forces.

Then, on August 13, U.S. fighter-bombers struck two targets only ten miles from the Chinese border. The next day Defense Department officials explained that "additional precautions" were in effect to avoid violations of Chinese air space. These precautions were said to include different flying tactics and better navigation and communications techniques. The President, at his press conference on August 19, said that our pilots employed "every human and every technical precaution."

Nevertheless, despite these additional precautions, two U.S. military planes were shot down inside China on August 21.

On September 8, the Secretary of State said that the war was being conducted "with the prudence that would minimize the risks" of Chinese intervention, but that he could offer no "gold-plated" guarantees that China would not intervene as a result of U.S. air attacks.

Now, this week, American aircraft have bombed only seven miles—or less than 60 seconds by jet—from the Chinese border.

Where is the prudence in that?

What did all the precautions prove?

What sense is there in creating a situation in which our men in Vietnam might be faced with an onslaught of hundreds of thousands of Chinese soldiers?

I thought that lesson was learned in Korea when a million Chinese poured across the border.

Few Americans today realize that tens of thousands of Chinese, in regular units of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, are already stationed in North Vietnam. They serve in anti-aircraft battalions. They engage in construction and reconstruction of roads. They repair railroad lines. The State Department says there are about 40,000 Chinese serving in North Vietnam now.

Admiral Sharp, U.S. Commander-in-Chief in the Pacific, has been less conservative in his estimate. He has stated that some 50,000 Chinese have been brought into North Vietnam already.

Whether we accept the State Department's figures or Admiral Sharp's, it is clear that the Chinese are already involved, and yet the Administration does not hesitate to escalate the war in Vietnam to the very rim of China.

If the Chinese have been sufficiently concerned about the U.S. presence in Vietnam to have sent 40 to 50 thousand men to Vietnam already, how can any prudent man presume that China will not do more if we continue to attack so close to her territory? And why

is it more effective to bomb rail lines seven miles from China than 30 miles from China?

If the Chinese increase their aid to North Vietnam, thus pressuring the Soviet Union to increase her aid to North Vietnam, what will our bombing policy have gained?

Do we want our men in Vietnam to meet even heavier resistance than that with which they must cope today? Do we really want to expand this war?

I have long believed that our national policy should be to try to create those circumstances in which de-escalation of the war might be achieved. But now I fear that the Administration is embarked on a course which could greatly expand the war.

Faced with the tremendous military power of China which has two and one-half million men under arms and millions more in the People's Militia, we can invite, by miscalculation, a bloodbath which would vastly multiply our casualties.

The American people do not want such a war and they do not want to take the risk of such a war. I for one don't want American men to be committed to an unlimited and uncontrolled war in Vietnam or to a massive conflict with China. If our half million troops cannot secure South Vietnam today from the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong, how many more millions of Americans would we have to send to do battle with the Chinese?

Some say that China is so torn by dissension that they will not intervene regardless of our overflights and our bombings so near their border. But I suggest that it is just as likely that they are so torn by dissension that they may seek to unite their people by waging war against us. The Secretary of State admits he is not sure that China will stay out of Vietnam.

Every one of us wants the best for our men in Vietnam, wants them properly equipped and properly supported. But if the Administration provokes China into escalating its military support of North Vietnam, will it have helped our troops, or will it have committed them to an expanded war for who knows how many years—a war in which more and more Americans will be committed to battle and an increasing number to death?

It is a time for the Administration to rethink its bombing policy, and hopefully to decide that the limited military gain in bombing near China is not worth the risks involved.

It is a time for legislators to speak out and urge a return to prudence and perspective.

It is a time for broadcasters and other public commentators to analyze the situation and to make themselves heard. Should the U.S. become gradually engaged in a war with China, while we keep silent, we will bear part of the responsibility for the human catastrophe which will result.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROUTY. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 2388 is the pending business.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 45, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following new section:

"HUMAN INVESTMENT AMENDMENT"

"SEC. 104. Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating part E as part F and by inserting immediately after part D the following new part E:

"PART E—HUMAN INVESTMENT JOB TRAINING"

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE"

"SEC. 161. The purpose of this part is to provide an incentive to American business to invest in the improvement of the Nation's human resources by hiring, training, and employing presently unemployed workers lacking needed job skills, and by upgrading the job skills of and providing new job opportunities for workers presently employed.

"DEFINITIONS"

"SEC. 162. For purposes of this part—

"(a) The term "employer" means any private person, corporation, firm, or business concern which employs more than ten individuals in a trade or business, and any public corporation or institution engaged in a trade or business, or providing health or educational services.

"(b) The term "employee training expenses" means—

"(1) the wages and salaries of employees who are apprentices in an apprenticeship program registered with a State apprenticeship agency or the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training;

"(2) the wages and salaries of employees who are enrolled in an on-the-job training program pursuant to section 204 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962;

"(3) the wages and salaries of employees who are participating in a cooperative education program involving alternate and approximately equal periods of study and employment in cooperation with—

"(A) a school or college, or department or division of a school or college, which is certified by the United States Commissioner of Education to be an area vocational education school as defined in section 8(2) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210), or

"(B) a business or trade school, or technical institution or other technical or vocational school, which is certified by the United States Commissioner of Education to be an eligible institution as defined in section 17(a) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-287);

"(4) tuition and course fees paid or incurred by the employer to—

"(A) a school or college, or department or division of a school or college, which is certified by the United States Commissioner of Education to be an area vocational education school as defined in section 8(2) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210), or

"(B) a business or trade school, or technical institution or other technical or vocational school, which is certified by the United States Commissioner of Education to be an eligible institution as defined in section 17(a) of the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-287)

for instruction of an individual in job skills necessary for and directly related to his em-

ployment by the employer or his continued employment with the employer in a position requiring additional job skills, and amounts paid or incurred by the employer to any such individual in reimbursement for such tuition and fees paid by such individual;

"(5) home study course fees paid or incurred by the employer to any home study school accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the United States Commissioner of Education for instruction of an individual in job skills necessary for and directly related to his employment by the employer or his continued employment with the employer in a position requiring additional job skills, and amounts paid or incurred by the employer to any such individual in reimbursement for such individual;

"(6) expenses of the employer for organized job training (including classroom instruction) provided by him including (but not limited to) expenses for the purchase or lease of books, testing and training materials, classroom equipment and related items, and instructors' fees and salaries, incurred in training any individual in job skills necessary for and directly related to his employment by the employer or his continued employment with the employer in a position requiring additional job skills;

"(7) expenses of the employer for organized job training described in paragraph (6) provided by another employer, but only to the extent the expenses of providing such instruction would, if it were provided by the employer, constitute employee training expenses of the employer under paragraph (6) of this subsection; and

"(8) expenses of the employer for organized job training described in paragraph (6) provided by a business or trade association, joint labor-management apprenticeship committee, or other similar nonprofit association, group, trust fund, foundation, or institution for an employee or prospective employee of any employer member of such association, committee, group, trust fund, foundation, or institution in job skills necessary for and directly related to his employment by such employer member or his continued employment with such employer member in a position requiring additional job skills.

"(c) The term "organized job training" means job training according to a plan formulated or approved by the employer which contains—

"(1) the title and description of the job objectives for which individuals are to be trained;

"(2) the length of the training period;

"(3) a schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(4) the wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

"(5) the entrance wage or salary paid to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the individuals are to be trained; and

"(6) the number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

"GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE JOB TRAINING

"Sec. 163. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to make grants to employers, in accordance with the provisions of this part, to pay up to 15 per centum of employee training expenses of such employer.

"LIMITATIONS

"Sec. 164. (a) No grant may be made under this part except upon an application submitted by an employer at such times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied

by such information, as the Secretary of Labor deems to be reasonably necessary.

"(b) No grant may be made under this part unless the employee training expenses paid or incurred by the employer for which the grant is to be made is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. For purposes of applying the preceding sentence, such expenses which are paid or incurred by the employer with respect to an individual who is not his employee shall be treated as paid or incurred with respect to an individual who is his employee.

"(c) No grant may be made under this part for any employee training expense paid or incurred in training any individual in—

"(1) management, supervisory, professional, or human relation skills;

"(2) scientific or engineering courses creditable to a baccalaureate degree by an institution of higher education (as defined by the first sentence of section 103(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958);

"(3) courses of a type determined by the Veterans' Administrator to be avocational or recreational in character under the authority of section 1673 of chapter 34 of part III of title 38, United States Code; or

"(4) subjects not contributing specifically and directly to such individual's employment or prospective employment with employer (or an employer member of an association, group, trust fund, foundation, or institution as used in paragraph (8) of section 162(b)).

This subsection shall not apply to—

"(A) expenses described in paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 162(b) paid or incurred for courses and at institutions certified by a State apprenticeship agency (or where none exists, by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training) as eligible for inclusion in a registered apprenticeship program in an apprenticeable occupation listed by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training;

"(B) expenses described in paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 162(b) paid or incurred for courses offered in a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological field which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge by an institution which is accredited or otherwise certified by the United States Commissioner of Education under paragraph 401(f) (5) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-204); or

"(C) expenses described in section 162(b) for training which has been approved by the agency of a State that administers its State unemployment compensation law for individuals receiving unemployment compensation.

"(d) No grant may be made under this part for any employee training expense for which the employer has been reimbursed by any other employer, by any association, group, trust fund, foundation, or institution, or by any State, local, or Federal Government program, grant, contract, or agreement.

"(e) No grant may be made under this part for any employee training expense paid or incurred by the employer for training conducted on the territory of any foreign country.

"(f) A grant may be made under this part for employee training expenses paid or incurred with respect to any one individual under either paragraph (3) or paragraph (4) of section 162(b), but may not be made for expenses concurrently paid or incurred with respect to such individual under both such paragraphs.

"COORDINATION WITH FEDERAL INCOME TAX LAWS

"Sec. 165. For purposes of applying chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, any grant received by an employer under this part—

"(1) shall not be included in the gross income of such employer, and

"(2) shall not be treated as reimbursement for expenses incurred by such employer in his trade or business.

"AUTHORIZATIONS

"Sec. 166. For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this part, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and for the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as the Congress shall appropriate."

Renumber the succeeding sections in title I accordingly.

On page 119, line 16, strike out "PART E" and insert in lieu thereof "PART F (as redesignated by this Act)".

On page 119, line 17, strike out "161" and insert in lieu thereof "171".

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the pending amendment represents a modification of my amendment No. 340, which has been printed and is on the Senators' desks. I will first enumerate the changes made.

On page 7, line 1, strike out the numeral "10" and insert "15."

On page 10, line 18, strike out "\$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969," and insert in lieu thereof, "in the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as the Congress shall appropriate."

Those are the only two changes made in the original amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this amendment is in essence the concept which has been introduced by me in the last two Congresses and which has become known throughout the country as the Human Investment Act.

As early as 1963, in a minority report on full employment promotion hearings which the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee held that year, I had advocated this concept with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN].

In those views, Senator JORDAN and I set forth the idea of using the tax credit principle to encourage private business to cope effectively with the serious problems of structural unemployment then, and now, plaguing the economy. To my knowledge, this was the first time a Member of Congress had advocated the application of a tax credit principle to job training efforts by private business.

Mr. President, this human investment proposal was not the first time that the tax credit idea had been used as an incentive measure for our economic well-being. In 1961, President Kennedy asked Congress to enact a tax credit to apply toward the cost of investment in depreciable property. Congress responded by enacting the Revenue Act of 1962, which contained provisions for a 7-percent tax credit toward the cost of private investment in equipment and machinery.

The concept of investment credit was to encourage and stimulate investment by American businessmen beyond what they might otherwise have planned. A

further expansion of our economy was the result.

So, also, Mr. President, would the Human Investment Act have stimulated the hiring and training of the unemployed in our Nation. The tax credit approach to the training of the unskilled would have been, and I still think, will eventually be, the road we will take properly to train those who lack it for the skills required in American business today.

Mr. President, the Congress passed the investment credit legislation by the overwhelming vote of 59 to 24 on September 6, 1962.

We know what advantages were brought about for our economy by the investment credit. I am firmly convinced that such an approach to training will be equally effective in helping solve others of our economic problems.

Indeed, Mr. President, if the Congress and business can work so successfully together as they have with investment credit, think what we can do also with a similar investment in human values through training of the unskilled.

We should not do for business and machines what we will not do for men, for their training, for their economic advancement, and the welfare of their families.

Initially, therefore, this amendment was drafted as separate legislation and was intended to grant a tax credit to employers for the amounts expended in keeping with the established goals of the poverty program; namely, to help train those enrolled to fill those jobs which are vacant in the American labor market.

Mr. President, I have been convinced since the poverty program was initiated, and this year there is an indication that the administration is beginning to agree with those of us who have championed the idea, that for the poverty program to function and meet with success, we must have the private sector of our economy intimately involved.

The amendment seeks to upgrade the skills of the American workingman so that he might take his appropriate place in our evermore technologically complex society.

At the same time, this amendment promotes the advancement of American industry and it permits those jobs to be done which our society finds necessary and desirable.

In 1965, the Wall Street Journal listed several problems confronting the American business world which result from the lack of skills in the unemployed to fill today's jobs. There is little doubt, I think, that these same problems are with us today. That article, which appeared in the Wall Street Journal for October 21, 1965, was entitled "Corporate Manhunt: Manpower Pinch Spurs Pirating, Increases Costs, Hurts Efficiency." Among other things, the article points out a number of deleterious effects of the shortage of skilled labor, among them:

First, scrap and waste in manufacturing have risen because less skilled workers are performing high-skill jobs;

Second, the costs of recruiting skilled workers is rising rapidly;

Third, supervisors are being put on production lines, resulting in less efficient management;

Fourth, some producers are losing business because of the inability to meet product delivery schedules;

Fifth, pirating of skilled workers is ruthlessly practiced in several areas of the economy; and

Sixth, more companies are actually recruiting in Europe to meet their skilled labor needs.

Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz told the Mayor's Conference on Employment in Chicago on November 3, 1965:

It appears unlikely that unemployment among those groups in which it is most serious . . . especially younger workers and minority groups—will be substantially reduced below present levels by any foreseeable economic expansion. The necessary improvement will have to come from measures aimed directly at these areas of concentrated unemployment, particularly at the increased preparation and training of those who have been left out of the general educational and employment opportunity patterns.

Mr. President, in order that those of us who deeply want something constructive to emerge from the poverty program might make a significant contribution to it, I offer the present amendment. I have had it rewritten so that it no longer provides a tax credit but within reasonable limits it provides for payments to industries and businesses for training and retraining of the disadvantaged poor.

ESSENTIAL PROVISIONS OF THE HUMAN INVESTMENT AMENDMENT

Mr. President, the provisions of this amendment are not really complex. It provides \$200 million for fiscal 1968 and such amount as may be necessary for fiscal 1969.

Essentially, the amendment provides for grants by the Secretary of Labor to businesses and industries of up to 15 percent of the costs of conducting a training program either to upgrade the skills of present employees for advancement or to train persons for employment who are presently unemployed.

These grants may be made to employers of 10 or more persons and they may be made for wages and salaries and expenses attendant upon the conduct of such training programs.

The program is, of course, limited to the extent to which authorized sums are appropriated.

Mr. President, the grants may be used to defray such expenses for training as would otherwise be deductible as a business expense, and they would not be includible in gross income nor would they be considered as reimbursement for expenses incurred.

In addition, Mr. President, grants would be approved only for submanagerial jobs, and only for jobs which, in the scientific community would be classed as subprofessional or assistantships.

The amendment also prohibits a grant to be made where the trainee would also be receiving assistance under work-study or vocational training programs.

The amounts for which payments would be made are those which would

be directed toward upgrading an individual's employment capability for equipping him to fill a prospective job within the organization providing the training.

Mr. President, much is beginning to be said by the administration and by ardent supporters in the Congress of the poverty program, about the necessity of involving the private sectors in the war on poverty. This amendment, I submit, is a perfect opportunity to do just that.

Mr. President, there continues a problem of increasing private participation in the manpower program. Of course, some businesses are very much in the field, as it were, and have proven successful with training programs. But, much remains to be done. I adhere to the belief that this human investment approach is necessary to obtain maximum private participation.

Mr. President, I understand that the administration is already making gestures in this area of increased private participation. Indeed, the Secretary of Labor, in the hearings on S. 1545 before our subcommittee in July of this year, pointed out that his Department was exploring private employer participation in training and job development.

Further that the Manpower Administration has already contracted with a few private employers for training and job placement programs.

This certainly points out that there is indeed a great potential for participation by the private employers of this Nation. Such indications point more clearly to the necessity of a cooperative effort on the part of the private and public sectors of our economy if we are to realize the possible goals through the means of job training and placement.

I submit, Mr. President, that this human investment approach to the problem can make very significant contributions to the training problems. It cannot continue much longer to be ignored by the Congress and the administration.

This amendment does not permit the luxury of makework programs. It does not put the untrained to work on jobs which are designed to satisfy the need for the moment. Rather, it assures that the untrained shall be trained or retrained to meet today's opportunities and to satisfy the needs both of themselves and the nation for tomorrow.

Mr. President, the authorization which this amendment carries, amounts to \$200 million for 1968. This Mr. President, is less than half the amounts authorized for title II of this bill as it was reported from our committee. I submit, however, that this approach is significantly more appropriate to satisfy the needs of the poor and the necessity of our Government to do something about the sad situation.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator inform me as to whether this would be \$200 million in addition to the entire appropriation suggested in the bill, or \$200 million being otherwise used at the moment which might be allocated to this worthy cause?

Mr. PROUTY. This would be in addition. But I assure the Senator that if agreed to by the Senate, a similar amount will be deducted from the total authorization.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, numerous articles in trade journals throughout the country have commented on the idea, most of them complimentary. Quite frankly, I have complete faith in the contribution which the Human Investment Idea can make to the war on poverty.

It is at least sufficiently meritorious to be permitted consideration with competing proposals which amount to little more than expensive welfare through make-work programs.

I realize, Mr. President, that there are presently training programs now being conducted by industry and commerce in the United States. The literature has extolled the virtues of these programs, and I commend their authors and the companies which have made significant contributions in this field.

This amendment, however, seeks to provide an added incentive to the American business community to make that extra effort to expand their training programs and to extend to even wider groups of the unemployed those opportunities for new skills which they so earnestly desire.

This amendment provides a certain way in which the Government and private enterprise can join forces to produce training programs which will have meaning in our day, and which will prove of value to our time.

In support of this amendment, Mr. President, each Member of the Senate has an opportunity to endorse a program which I am convinced will prove to be of much greater significance in the fulfillment of the promise of the war on poverty than will any amount which can be appropriated simply to put people to work in some kind of job.

Mr. President, I want to reiterate that I am firmly convinced in the worth of this program in what has become our national effort to see that the jobs which our technically advanced society makes available are filled with persons who have been trained in the skills which they require.

The advantages of this human investment approach to training are many and varied. But what is more important it trains two kinds of people. First it will train those persons who have no skills which are usable in today's labor market.

Second, and what is equally important, it will retain those who are currently working but who must acquire new skills in order to cope with the different tasks which automation and advancing technology have thrust upon us.

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity of retraining as well as training. I am particularly proud of the human investment approach to training because it recognizes this fact and permits retraining of the American workman as well as training of the American man who is unfortunate enough not to be working at the present time.

I should like to quote briefly from some statements which have been made in the past. First, a quote from former Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor who said, in an address in Dallas-Fort Worth in March of 1966:

Shortages of skilled labor are now becoming of growing concern in a number of geographical areas and industries.

He went on to make a plea for a new devotion to job training:

We can progress no faster than labor is trained to operate our increasingly complex machines. Nowhere is cooperation among government, business, and labor more urgently needed.

Commenting on President Johnson's message to Congress on manpower, the AFL-CIO News stated:

Johnson paid tribute to the effectiveness of job training and retraining with special emphasis on the value of on-the-job training as a proved technique for making useful and productive citizens from those previously considered beyond help.

Mr. President, I could comment at great length on the views expressed by those experienced in this field but, for the time being, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Vermont will yield to me before he yields the floor, I should like to be sure that I understand the Senator's amendment and would like to ask him a few questions.

On page 2, at the top, under the statement of purpose, it is my understanding that the purpose of the amendment is to give a subsidy or a grant to private employers for profit in order to encourage them to hire, train, and employ presently unemployed workers who lack needed job skills and that this, accordingly, would apply whether the unemployed workers were members of the poor.

Mr. PROUTY. Let me say that the details of any grant or contract would have to be worked out between the Secretary of Labor and the employer who sought to engage in some training program. It would be up to the Secretary of Labor and the employer to determine the type and nature of the training. Thus, the Secretary of Labor has a very real voice in the type of training.

Mr. CLARK. As I read the amendment, and the Senator will correct me if I am wrong, those eligible to be employed by the employer who would receive the 15-percent subsidy or 15 percent of the cost of the training expenses from the wages paid to a worker, need not be members of the poor. This is perhaps a ridiculous example, but might it not include a millionaire temporarily out of work?

Mr. PROUTY. I am sure that the Senator knows that would not occur. We all have enough confidence in the Secretary of Labor to know he would make sure that this program will be a highly constructive one, which would enable people who lack skills to gain them. Some of them could be employed at the lower end of the pay scale and could then be trained and be upgraded within the industry, so that there would be more room at the bottom level for other people coming in to receive the additional train-

ing. We should have sufficient confidence in the Secretary of Labor to know that any contracts or grants which he approves will be made on a thoroughly reliable basis.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator agree, however, that, as a matter of legal draftsmanship, the amendment is wide open to permit any unemployed person, regardless of his economic status, to come within the purview of the amendment and thus permit the employer to be subsidized?

Mr. PROUTY. I do not read it that way. Certainly, that is not the intent of the amendment. In order to make legislative history, it should be pointed out that that is not the objective or the intent of the amendment. As a matter of fact, the language in the proposed amendment is much more definite than will be found generally in the so-called work-training programs in the poverty law as it exists today. Many of them can mean anything or nothing, and they are often highly nebulous in their language. This amendment, I think, is quite specific in what it proposes to do.

Mr. CLARK. Let us disagree on that, because I would take the position in debate that this amendment would permit an employer to receive 15 percent of the wages he paid to an individual who otherwise qualified under the amendment, whether that individual was a member of the poor or not. Does the Senator categorically disagree with me?

Mr. PROUTY. Will the Senator kindly ask that question again, I am sorry?

Mr. CLARK. I would take the position that the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, as presently drawn, would permit an employer to be recompensed for up to 15 percent of the wages he paid and the expenses incurred by an unemployed individual, whether that unemployed individual was a member of the poor or not—in fact, independent of the economic status of the particular individual who was to come under coverage of the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. That certainly is not the intent of my amendment. I do not think it means that. Let me reiterate that the training which the amendment contemplates certainly comes completely within the purview of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I think what the Senator from Pennsylvania is worried about is whether or not this language specifically keeps this in the field of the entire attack on poverty.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. So it is a matter of specific language. I might suggest that the Senator from Vermont would not object since he agrees that this is the objective.

Mr. PROUTY. I think that would be true, but let me point out the criteria which the Secretary of Labor is using for the employment-training program. I will read those criteria:

1. *Educationally deficient*—An unemployed or underemployed person who lacks the fundamental literacy and social skills to enable him to benefit from occupational training, but who has the potential mental and physical capabilities to become employable on a full-time basis.

2. *Handicapped*—A person with a physical, mental or emotional disability who is unemployed or underemployed, but who has the potential capacity to become employable on a full-time basis.

3. *Long-term unemployed*—A person who has been involuntarily out of work for 15 or more weeks, and in need of occupational training, basic education, and/or other services in order to become employable on a full-time basis.

4. *Minority*—A member of a racial, religious, or ethnic group who is unemployed or underemployed, and who because of this background has not had an equal opportunity to prepare for and obtain suitable employment on a full-time basis, or has not been able to advance beyond entry status in an occupation. Examples of minority group members who may have experienced employment discrimination are Negroes, Spanish Americans, Mexican Americans, persons with foreign language backgrounds, religious sect members, and American Indians.

5. *Older worker*—A person 45 years of age or over, who is unemployed or underemployed, unskilled, or whose skills have become obsolete, and who needs occupational training in order to obtain suitable employment on a full-time basis.

6. *Poverty level*—Annual net family income level criteria established by the Office of Economic Opportunity for—

Nonfarm:

1 person	\$1,500
2 persons	2,000
2-7 persons	2,000
Over 7 persons	5,000

Farm:

1 person	1,090
2 persons	1,400
3 persons	1,750
4 persons	2,000
5 persons	2,400
6 persons	2,800
7 persons	3,150
Over 7 persons	3,500

¹ Plus \$500 each.

Important segments of the "poverty-level" group who may not be in the other "Disadvantaged" categories are women head of families, welfare recipients, workers living in rural or isolated geographic areas, and migrant farm workers.

7. *Prison releases*—A person released from prison or eligible for work or training under a released or program, who needs basic education, occupational training and/or other services in order to become employable on a full-time basis.

8. *Disadvantaged youth*—A person between the ages of 16 and 22, who is out of school and out of work, who comes from a severely impoverished environment, and who needs occupational training, basic education, and/or other services in order to become employable on a full-time basis.

9. *Selective Service or Volunteer rejectee*—A male who failed to meet the requirements for the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT), who is unemployed or underemployed and needs occupational training, basic education, and/or other services in order to become employable on a full-time basis.

Those are the criteria which the Secretary is presently following, and I assume he might extend or change them to some degree.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What was the Senator from Vermont reading from?

Mr. PROUTY. U.S. Department of Labor News, for release 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 27, 1967.

Mr. CLARK. Which, of course, is not a part of this amendment.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending Prouty amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour beginning now, and at the end of that hour that there be a live quorum; that following the establishment of a quorum, there be 20 minutes for additional debate, the time to be equally divided in both instances between the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]; after which the vote be taken.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a two-page statement on another matter that I simply must make, in fairness to my own record and in fairness to the President of the United States in reply to some comments that have been made on the floor today. Therefore, I could not enter into that agreement unless it could be understood that I would have not more than 7 minutes to make that statement.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be recognized now, for not to exceed 7 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has completed his speech, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be recognized for not to exceed 7 minutes, after which time the time on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]; that following that 1 hour there be a live quorum, following which there be 20 additional minutes on the amendment and all amendments thereto, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], after which there be a vote taken immediately.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I would suggest to the Senator from West Virginia that the inclusion of "and all amendments thereto" does open the door to all kinds of parliamentary procedures, and I would hope we could protect ourselves from either side coming in with amendments that could be quite irrelevant and change the tone of the whole debate. If the Senator would leave out the words "and all amendments thereto," I would be happy to consent.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. My purpose in including the words "and all

amendments thereto" was to preclude other amendments coming in and throwing the time frame out of kilter.

Mr. CLARK. Suppose some misguided Senator came in and moved to recommit the entire bill as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, or to offer any other amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I am afraid would throw us off? I myself have no amendment to propose.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I have no objection to the Senator's proposal except I wish to modify my amendment to meet the objections of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the Senator that he provide 10 minutes a side in debate on amendments to the amendment. I suggest that that be included in the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. And that there be 10 minutes on a side for any amendments to the amendment, moved by any Senator other than the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I repeat my unanimous-consent request as modified by the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Now, Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, there is one other thing I would like to get settled now. I am anxious to get the floor as soon as this amendment is disposed of—which I assume will be tomorrow—for my principal address, which I have not yet made, though I am the ranking member of this committee.

Therefore, I would appreciate it if the Senator from West Virginia would seek unanimous consent, or I will seek it, that I may have 40 minutes, when the pending amendment is disposed of, or whenever we get back on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, would the Chair put the motion made by the Senator from West Virginia at this point?

Mr. JAVITS. Could I suggest that the Chair restate it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think the Chair is a little bit confused.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Chair permit the Senator from West Virginia to restate it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would be delighted.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of the statement of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be recognized for not to exceed 7 minutes, following which the debate on the pending amendment be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]; following which there be a live quorum; following which there be 20 minutes for continued debate on the amendment, the time to be equally divided between the Senator

from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]; and that the time on all amendments thereto, if there be such, be limited to 20 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the mover of the amendment and the opponent of the amendment; and that following such debate there be a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, with the understanding that amendments to the amendment must be germane. I say that to the Senator because we are not going to open this to a 10-minute debate on a motion to recommit or some other great big thing.

But if the amendment is germane—

Mr. CLARK. To the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. If the amendments are germane to the amendment, then it is 10 minutes on a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia wish to limit the time on motions as well as on amendments? A motion to recommit would not be covered by the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, I would suggest that the proposal that all amendments must be germane to this amendment would rule out a motion to recommit.

Mr. JAVITS. In any case, the unanimous consent is not to apply to motions to recommit. If it does, I will object to it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Then, Mr. President, we will exclude motions to recommit from the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, when the unfinished business is laid before the Senate, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be recognized for not to exceed 40 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 340

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have at the desk a further modification of the pending amendment, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "unemployed" insert the words "low income".

On page 2, line 8, after the word "for", the same modification.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

THE TONKIN GULF RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, much has been said in and out of Congress in recent weeks that seeks to shift from Congress to the President the blame for what has been done in South Vietnam under the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

A presidential candidate attributed his earlier support for the war to "brainwashing." Today the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] implied that the President was going beyond the Tonkin Gulf resolution in conducting the war. I respectfully reply to him by saying that, in my judgment, much of what he said was a labored, after-the-fact misinterpretation of the language of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

In my opinion, there never was anything obscure or misleading about the language of the Tonkin Gulf resolution, or what it authorized. It authorized the President to do whatever he deemed necessary to prevent aggression.

That language reminded me at the time of nothing more than Abraham Lincoln's explanation to his friend of why he voted against a resolution giving similar powers to President Polk to use against Mexico. "See if you can find any limits to it," he said.

That is true, too, of the Tonkin Gulf resolution. It is unlimited. The language in it now is the same as it was in August of 1964, when it was considered and debated on this floor, and in the other body.

For at least 2 days, my colleague from Alaska and I asked Senators, in effect, if they could see any limits to the Tonkin Gulf resolution. We asked what was meant by the word "prevent" aggression; we asked what was meant by the word "aggression" itself; we asked what country or countries were meant whose aggression we would prevent; we asked where and in what period of time the authority it tried to vest in the President could be exercised.

We got few answers. Senators did not like to talk about things like that. They did not seem to want to think about them or consider them.

The debate was even more perfunctory in the House of Representatives. But no limits to the language of the resolution were mentioned over there, either.

I am very much at a loss to understand what reasonable justification there is now for anyone to say he was "brainwashed" about our policy in Vietnam, as one supposed candidate for the nomination for the Presidency has been saying, or for anyone to stand on the floor of the Senate and question the President's sincerity or motivation in regard to the Tonkin Gulf resolution. He has acted in the open, foursquare. He has told us exactly what the resolution meant from the very beginning; and he has told us on other occasions that as long as it is on the books, he intends to follow the decision of Congress in passing the resolution.

Mr. President, the sad truth is that the resolution sought to give congressional sanction in advance to just about anything the President did in Southeast Asia or anywhere else, for congressional support of his measures to "prevent further aggression" does not even say "prevent it in Asia." It does not say the aggression must be against the United States nor against our Armed Forces.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—who was referred to by the Senator from New Jersey today, and as to whom I believe that the Senator

from New Jersey is mistaken as to what he, the Senator from Arkansas, sought to represent to the Senate—has stated since that he made a mistake in the manner in which he handled that resolution in the Senate. He has not tried to shift blame to others. But among all the other critics who deplore what has been done under it, I have not heard anyone else state that they themselves erred, or were wrong, or failed to give the resolution the attention it deserved.

No; the effort is made every day to blame the President and the executive branch for what has been done under the resolution. My answer to them is: Every Senator who voted for that resolution is just as responsible for what has been done under it as is the President to whom the Congress tried to give its own constitutional powers.

Unless and until Senators vote to rescind the Tonkin Gulf resolution, or pass a new one superseding it, or refuse to vote the supplies to carry out Presidential policies under it, they, too, are responsible for the war in Vietnam and the manner of its execution.

The authors of the Constitution tried to save Congress from the situation in which so many Members now find themselves, of fearing the length of the conflict and where it may lead. They tried to save us from that predicament by giving to us, not to the President, the authority to wage war. They tried again to save us by giving us the exclusive power to raise and maintain armies and to appropriate money.

When Congress has tried to evade those responsibilities, it has regretted it. But I would hope we could have an end to trying to blame the President for our evasion of duty, and an end to charges like "brainwashing" to excuse a failure to exercise an independent judgment.

As one who has criticized the passage of the resolution, and who seriously disagreed with the President for offering the resolution, I wish to say, however, that I think it is unfair to criticize the sincerity, the dedication, and the motivation of the President of the United States in offering the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

If we do not like it we should change it. The President has made clear that as long as it remains on the books, he intends to follow it. And the checking power rests in the Senate.

We can change, rescind, or modify the resolution any time Senators and Congressmen are ready to substitute their votes for their accusations.

SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME OF THE MEETING OF FOREIGN MINISTERS OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was one of the delegates, along with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] to the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States, held in Washington last week. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I were delegates on the part of the Senate. Mr. MAILLIARD and Mr. SELDEN were delegates on the part of the House.

I extend my high compliments to Secretary of State Dean Rusk and to the

American Ambassador to the Organization of American States, Mr. Linowitz, for the diplomatic statesmanship they performed at a historic conference.

I am extremely heartened at the outcome of the meeting of Foreign Ministers of the OAS which, as Senators know, ended Sunday in a virtually unanimous condemnation of Castro-inspired subversion in the Americas. The meeting thus successfully achieved the prime objectives that were its aim.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 2 minutes be equally divided and taken out of the time allowed each side on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the true nature of the Castro challenge in Venezuela, Bolivia, and other Latin American countries was revealed for what it is: an illegal and desperate effort to undermine free institutions and to foment hatred and terrorism.

And this, in turn, underscored the most basic fact of all—that the most effective answer to the Castro threat is to be found in a common course of action among the republics of this hemisphere.

As I sat with our delegation in the Pan American Union—our “Casa de las Americas”—I therefore felt a sense of deep pride and satisfaction not only because the answer given by the Foreign Ministers was a deeply responsible one but because it demonstrated the unequivocal unity that exists among the representatives of the free American republics.

This answer—a responsible answer—reflected, I believe, both a new spirit of hemispheric solidarity and a rededication to basic American principle.

It represents, too, a strengthening of traditional bonds of mutual assistance, and it underlined our determination to safeguard hard won progress toward universal democracy and major social and economic development.

For let us not be deluded. Our main goal remains—as Secretary Rusk emphasized—the realization of peaceful revolution through the Alliance for Progress.

For we must make no mistake. We face, as the Foreign Ministers emphasized, a serious problem that must be met immediately. But we also face a long-range problem that must be solved in a common effort to strengthen the hemisphere economically and socially. Communism in this hemisphere and elsewhere feeds on poverty, despair, and social inequality.

What gratifies me in particular, as I say, was that underlying the action of the Foreign Ministers was the knowledge that in the long run Latin America's economic and social illnesses must be cured by the Alliance for Progress. When we do, we will rid the hemisphere of those

very conditions that now offer fertile ground for ideologies foreign to the traditions, institutions, and character of all the people of the Americas.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] duplicates a number of other provisions in the committee bill which are designed to provide incentives for private employers.

First, section 123(a)(8) of the committee bill authorizes an incentive for the hiring by private employers of low income and unemployed persons and authorizes such payments as: first, reimbursements for expenses and commuter transportation; second, reimbursement for the hire of an employee not fully productive; and third, payment of employer costs of sending recruiters into low-income areas.

This particular provision was also proposed in an amendment by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and accepted by the majority members.

Second, the amendment also duplicates the Manpower Development and Training Act on its various job training programs. Third, the amendment duplicates provisions of the Kennedy-Javits special impact program which is designed to provide economic and community development in ghetto areas employing low-income persons on such projects.

The Senator from Vermont has now remodified his amendment so that, as I was able to listen to his proposed modification—which I have not yet seen in print—it would apply only to individuals who would fall into the category of poorer people. It did not originally have that limitation.

I am glad that the Senator has been willing to modify the amendment.

I should like to take a more careful look at the language to be sure that it is appropriate for that purpose.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. I ask whether section 164(b) does not in effect amend the Internal Revenue Code and is not, therefore, a violation of the Senate rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator referring to a section within the amendment?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct. Section 164(b), line 9, on page 7 of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the point of the parliamentary inquiry that this would involve raising revenue and, as such, must originate in the House of Representatives?

Mr. CLARK. In effect, it is an amendment of the Internal Revenue Code which, as I understand the rules of the Senate, cannot be brought up by way of amendment unless there is before the Senate an appropriate fiscal measure to amend the Revenue Code, brought out of the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont wish to be heard?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I point out that this question occurred to me. I discussed it with the draftsman, and he expressed the opinion that it in no way would have anything to do with the Internal Revenue Code insofar as tax legislation is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the language of section 164(b) lines 9 through 18 on page 7, and the language on lines 5 through 14 on page 10 of the pending amendment may be the subject of a constitutional point which must be decided by the Senate, if the Senator wishes to raise the constitutional point.

It is not subject to a point of order based on the rules of the Senate, as was originally suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Chair amplify what it means by constitutional point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the Constitution, revenue-raising measures must originate in the House of Representatives.

Under the precedents of the Senate, the Chair has always submitted such a constitutional point to be decided by the Senate itself, rather than the Chair ruling, as the Chair frequently can and does, on a strict point of order.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Chair.

I will make the argument that whether or not this matter is submitted to the Senate as a constitutional matter, it is fairly clear to me that the proposal would amend the Internal Revenue Code without any authority under the Constitution. I shall not press that argument at the moment.

I now yield myself 2 minutes to express to the Senate the opposition of the Department of Labor to the proposed amendment, as I received it a few moments ago.

I should like to point out that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont was printed on September 25, so that we on this side of the aisle have had no adequate opportunity to inspect it or study it in depth—nor, indeed, has the Department of Labor. Nevertheless, the Department of Labor has this to say, and I quote from a memorandum they furnished me only a few moments ago:

The incentives offered by this measure would fail to stimulate additional or new manpower development and training efforts in the private sector. It would represent a windfall, particularly in regard to existing apprenticeship programs and MDTA-OJT training programs.

As the Department reads the bill, it would offer the employer 15 percent of

training expenses under registered apprenticeship programs, an item for which he is not now reimbursed, plus 15 percent of wages.

I interpolate "15 percent" instead of "10 percent," which is actually in the Department of Labor memorandum, because the Senator from Vermont has increased, within the last few minutes, the 10-percent figure to 15 percent in his memorandum:

Secondly, it would add a 15% wage cost to the training expenses under MDTA-OJT for which the employer is presently reimbursed.

The statement of purpose in Section 161 is the only reference in the bill to the group at which its measures are aimed. This falls to zero in on the hard core disadvantaged.

Even after the amendment by which the Senator from Vermont recently modified his amendment—

If we are to move to a wage subsidy concept, even with the restrictions and regulatory approach in this measure, we must be more explicit about the groups who will be included and there is no definition of employee or prospective employee contained in the bill. As a result, an employer could receive a 15% grant to reimburse him for the wages and training costs involved in hiring an individual he was about to hire at the moment the bill was passed, (so long as the individual was unemployed at that time)—

And comes within the other restrictions as Senator PROUTY has modified his amendment. And this would be without regard to the length of unemployment or other characteristics of the individual concerned. He might have lost his job last week and be on unemployment compensation, and yet he would be eligible under the proposed amendment:

If we are to move the hard core into employment with the aid of this type of approach, we must write definite restrictions into the bill specifying who will be eligible and on what terms.

A hasty estimate of the impact of this bill reveals that the entire appropriation for the first year would be expended for reimbursement and grants to employers for wages and training expenses associated with the employment and training of the current total of registered apprentices and MDTA-OJT enrollees. This is based upon 200,000 registered apprentices and an average of \$125 a week and 110,000 MDTA-OJT enrollees at an average of \$80 a week, exclusively for wage cost.

There would be no increased funds available for training the hard core unemployed.

Finally, Mr. President, the proposed amendment raises havoc with the entire concept of the committee bill. It cuts across title I and title II, and it substitutes a new program for some which are already in the bill.

I ask the Senator from Vermont this question: Where does the Senator propose to get the \$200 million? Is this to be in addition to the amount of authorization brought in by the committee?

Mr. PROUTY. I might say that if the amendment should remain without a further amendment, it would be an additional authorization. But I can assure the Senator that the amendment may be further modified to take care of that problem.

While I am on my feet, I should like to refer the Senator to testimony given

by the Secretary of Labor, I believe, page 3231, "Examination of the War on Poverty" hearings of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, in which he stated:

The most underdeveloped aspect of the manpower program (and possibly of the poverty program as well) involves the potential for increased private participation. . . .

At the President's instruction, the Secretary of Commerce and I are undertaking a survey of employer training programs to determine how public programs can be most effectively coordinated with them.

There is much more which I will ask to have printed in the RECORD later.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for Senator CLARK, I yield myself 5 minutes.

There is no question about the fact that the proposed amendment puts its finger on one of the most critical aspects of the war on poverty—that is, the effort to bring the private enterprise system effectively into manpower training and job-giving activity.

If the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont stood alone, I would be the first to embrace it. The difficulty is that it does not stand alone, as he has so properly pointed out.

I value the work which was done by Senator PROUTY, including the work on this amendment, and his sponsorship, with so many others of us, of the so-called Human Investment Act. That act certainly should be passed, and, as he properly said, the proposed amendment is a variant of that concept. So in discussing this matter—in a sense, in the family, because Senator PROUTY is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee which deals with this question, and I am a member of that subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the full committee—we are talking about what is the best way to approach a particular problem.

First, let me identify the problem. The problem is a very real one—to bring the private employer into the matter of training the slum or ghetto worker. With such employees, you may have to start way back in the training and education process, and on a basis which is completely uneconomical so far as the employer is concerned. Nonetheless, it is enormously important to the national interest to bring the employer into the entire concept because of the tremendous range of means and opportunity which private enterprise offers.

Mr. President, in the bill is a provision I had the honor to include which seeks to deal with this problem. It does not deal with the problem exactly the same way that the Senator from Vermont does; but it deals with the problem, and in a very effective way. I should like to go into that matter, because it represents an important point with respect to the question of whether or not we should adopt this new approach.

It will be found at page 32 of the bill and represents one of the provisions for

eligible job training activities under the bill.

This authority as contained in the bill is for—and I read from page 32, line 15 through page 33, line 10:

(8) programs to provide incentives to private employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train or employ unemployed or low-income persons, including arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to employers for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, payment of on-the-job counseling and other supportive services, payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of unemployed or low-income persons, and payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation:

Then, there is a proviso relating to minimum wages.

In this way we are seeking to open up the whole job giving-job training private function to private firms under contract with OEO. This would do precisely what the Senator from Vermont seeks also to do, except he provides a specific percentage for the employee training expenses, to wit, up to 15 percent, whereas the bill would cover a variety of expenses which would be negotiated, including transportation. I mention this because we learned in the case of Watts, Calif., that transportation was one of the large and complicated problems. Even in New York I found in my investigation that there are parts of the city where in order to get people to move and go elsewhere for training and the hope for a job, provision has to be made for some of the very rudimentary and elementary costs of transportation of the person from place to place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in some cases it was even lunch money which made all the difference as to whether a poor person would or would not move from that area.

I might point out that the incentives provided in the bill would reimburse employers for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive. The difference is the difference between the economic wage and the minimum wage, or whatever wage higher than that might be provided by the contract. The amounts which are allowed in respect to this matter are \$15 million. The report also provides for appropriate regulations against abuses of these incentive programs, for example, in order to guard against the transfer of an enterprise from one area to another, using the incentive payment as a subsidy for the purpose, or in other ways to subsidize normal operations.

I believe the flexibility given by this provision in the bill is preferable to the more limited approach contained in the amendment which is before the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that I am not dug in on the subject. This is definitely an intelligent and extremely

useful opening up of the opportunity for training and jobs to dwellers in the slums and ghettos. Naturally, I prefer my approach, but I am not dug in on the subject.

One of the other things that troubles me is that, as the Senator from Vermont said, the \$200 million provided for by his amendment would come out of some other part of the bill. I am sure he will disclose to us where it will come from. That approach represents a problem for this reason. This bill is pretty spartan in any case. We all know about the unbelievable demands of the war on poverty, and \$200 million is 10 percent, or a very appreciable part thereof.

The provision in the bill which relates to the same matter as the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, has the advantage of not absorbing an important part of the other resources of the bill since special funds are provided to implement it. The amendment before the Senate would deduct \$200 million from other aspects of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it would soak up a substantial sum of money which may prove to be extremely important to the functioning of the entire bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the Senator may have to request time on his own behalf.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to comment on the statement of the Senator about section 123(a)(8) and point out that would be solely within the jurisdiction of the community action agencies. It seems to me that the local community action agencies would have many difficulties administering it. In fact, many people in the agencies are those who need the training themselves. If a community action agency is encouraged to assume the role of training programmer, we would run into a great deal of trouble not only in the business community but in the agency itself.

Furthermore, there is no specified amount of money authorized to carry out the provisions of the act. No one knows how much will be allocated to it. Under my proposal a definite amount is set aside for use only to train the unemployed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. One of the problems I have is tying up \$200 million. I approve rather than disapprove of the idea of doing in this field only what is realistically possible and allocating only whatever money can be well used rather than to setting aside \$200 million to do this. If it is not done within the time allotted

to that amount, the money is lost to the program.

I think the idea of not doing that commends the approach in the bill rather against the approach of the amendment.

Mr. President, I conclude as I began. I am not dug in on this matter. The Senator from Vermont has used creativity and thoughtfulness in doing what we both are trying to do effectively. However, since this is a new beginning in this field, I prefer the provisions of the bill to the provisions of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 27 minutes and the Senator from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, it seems to me that those of us who have supported the so-called war on poverty in the past and who continue to support it, are trying to bring about really effective training programs.

I think that no one familiar with the situation can deny that the most effective training programs thus far have been those conducted under the Manpower and Development Training Act, and on-the-job training. Most authorities maintain that these training programs are the only means really to achieve the goals we seek.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like very much to support the amendment and would ask the Senator the following questions: Would he be agreeable—as he has already stated that he was going to do some modifying of the amendment—to doing two things. I should like to support the amendment, as I said, because it is creative, in my judgment, and seeks the same objectives I have sought myself, and the Senator and I have worked so well together I do not want this to mar it—one, if we had some idea as to where the Senator would later propose to cut in order to compensate for the \$200 million provided; and, second, if the Senator would be willing to provide in the language, which we can do without too much trouble, that to the extent it is not used the \$200 million in authorization shall continue to be available under that part of the bill which the Senator ultimately intends to cut.

Mr. PROUTY. Answering the Senator's first question, I am perfectly willing to point out that it is my present intention—it was not originally—but in order to develop additional support for my proposal—to propose to modify the amendment to reduce by \$200 million—assuming that the amendment will be approved—the total authorization for title I.

Regarding the second question, I should like to mull that over in my mind a little bit, because it has not occurred to me. It may create some difficulties. I would hesitate to do that unless I had some assurance from the Secretary of Labor that a maximum effort was going to be made in that direction. I have not

discussed it with him. Thus, without some assurance that a substantial portion of this money would be utilized, I would be hesitant to follow the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. JAVITS. May I make this suggestion to the Senator, inasmuch as we shall both be conferees on the bill, whether he would express his intention that, subject to the conviction that there will be every effort made really to do this job, that he does not intend to freeze all the money if it cannot be fully utilized for the purpose. I am sure we will be able to work it out. The intent is very important to me.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is absolutely right about that. I want this money to be used for constructive purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. But if it is not used, it shall not be cut out of the program.

Mr. PROUTY. Oh no.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Vermont very much. I hope to be able to support his amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I appreciate the help of the Senator from New York very much.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time not to be charged to either side, in order to give the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] an opportunity to get back to the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I yield back the remainder of the time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and this is to be the live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 267 Leg.]

Aiken	Griffin	Morse
Allott	Gruening	Morton
Anderson	Hansen	Moss
Bartlett	Harris	Mundt
Bayh	Hart	Murphy
Bennett	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Nelson
Boggs	Holland	Pell
Brewster	Hollings	Percy
Brooke	Inouye	Prouty
Burdick	Jackson	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Russell
Carlson	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Case	Lausche	Smith
Church	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Clark	Long, La.	Spong
Cooper	Magnuson	Stennis
Cotton	Mansfield	Talmadge
Curtis	McCarthy	Thurmond
Dirksen	McClellan	Tower
Dominick	McGee	Tydings
Eastland	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	Metcalfe	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Fong	Monroney	
Gore	Montoya	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. Under the unanimous consent request, the remaining time on the amendment is to be equally divided between the two sides. Who yields time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I send to the desk an amendment which modifies the pending amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered at this time, in view of the fact that a part of it refers to another section of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the Senator from Vermont would mind waiting until the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] comes to the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged against the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Will the Senator repeat his request?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a modification of my amendment, and, since a part of it refers to another section of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. PROUTY. I have sent to the desk a modification of my amendment. Since part of it refers to another section of the bill, I have asked unanimous consent to have it considered.

Mr. CLARK. I have no objection. I assume the Senator will either have it read or stated.

Mr. PROUTY. Oh, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the modification.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 10, following line 24, at the end of the amendment, add the following:

On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$2,258,000,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,058,000,-000."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, did the clerk say page 10?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will restate the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 10, following line 24, at the end of the amendment, insert the following:

On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$2,258,000,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,058,000,-000."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Is this not an amendment to the amendment which, under the unanimous-consent agreement, results in 10 minutes to a side being given on this amendment to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Vermont, by unanimous consent, got a modification that hit another part in the bill.

The Senator from Vermont will proceed.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment, but one, I think, that is of great importance to the manpower training program in this country.

The amendment provides an authorization of \$200 million which would be made available to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of making grants to employers of up to 15 percent of the cost of training and retraining programs of the underemployed and the unemployed in an effort to solicit the active participation of private enterprise in this field.

The amendment also would reduce the authorization under title I of the bill by a similar amount, \$200 million.

Let me first point out that this is a principle involved in the Human Investment Act which I first introduced in 1965. That was a tax credit.

Such a proposal, if made in the Senate, would be subject to a point of order in the other body which would insist on its prerogative of initiating tax legislation. Therefore, this amendment simply provides that funds will be utilized for grants to help with expenses of training the unemployed and the underemployed when such a program is undertaken by the private enterprise system.

The allowable employee training expenses are as follows:

First. The wages and salaries of employees who are apprentices in an apprenticeship program registered with a State apprenticeship agency or the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

Second. The wages and salaries of employees who are enrolled in an on-the-job training program pursuant to section 204 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Third. The wages and salaries of employees who are participating in a cooperative education program involving alternate periods of academic study and employment in cooperation with a secondary school, college, university, business school, trade school, or vocational school.

Fourth. Tuition and course fees paid by the taxpayer for the instruction of any individual by a college, university, business school, trade school, or vocational school in job skills necessary for his employment by the taxpayer or for his continued employment with the taxpayer.

Fifth. Home study course fees paid by

the taxpayer for the instruction of any individual by a college, university, or accredited home study school in job skills necessary for his employment by the taxpayer or for his continued employment with the taxpayer.

Sixth. Expenses to the taxpayer of organized job training—including classroom instruction—including expenses for the purchase or lease of books, testing and training materials, classroom equipment, and instructors' fees and salaries, incurred in training any individual in job skills necessary for his employment by the taxpayer or for his continued employment with the taxpayer.

Seventh. Expenses to the taxpayer of organized job training provided by another taxpayer.

Eighth. Expenses to the taxpayer of organized job training provided by a business or trade association, joint labor-management apprenticeship committee or other similar nonprofit association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the most effective training programs in the country today have been the on-the-job training programs and those conducted under the Manpower Development Training Act. This is a way to make the war on poverty really work and get these unemployed and underemployed people into jobs with the private sector and reimburse private enterprise to a certain extent for their training costs.

We should not forget that about 85 percent of the costs will still be assumed by industry and not by the Federal Government, as has been the case in most of these other programs.

I think this is a worthwhile approach. I hope very much that the proposal will receive the support of the Senate.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does this amendment of the Senator contemplate adding \$200 million to the Clark proposal, or does it contemplate transferring \$200 million to another place in the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. It has nothing to do with the Clark proposal; namely, title II of the bill.

This would authorize \$200 million for this training program, but it would also reduce the authorization in title I by the same amount, \$200 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would not add another \$200 million to the \$5 billion program.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Vermont have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The Senator from Vermont has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Vermont had his amendment printed on September 25. We had an opportunity to look at it for the first time this afternoon. It is a 10-page amendment and is extremely complicated.

The Senator from Vermont has modified it three times since he first called it up, and there are no copies of his modification available except to the extent that some of us have been able to ink in the modification changes.

His latest modification calls for striking \$200 million out of the present title I of the bill and adding it to a new section or title or new part called the Human Investment Act.

The Senator does not say where that \$200 million is to be taken from in title I. Is it to come from the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Headstart, or VISTA?

There is no indication. Really, this amendment creates a chaotic legislative condition and gives nobody any guidance as to what would happen to the \$200 million which was set forth in title I of the bill and is now removed without any indication as to where it is removed from.

This amendment overlaps, as I said earlier in the debate, 3 other titles in the committee bill without any indication as to how the duplication is to be resolved by the administrator.

In the very short time which was available to the Department of Labor to look at the proposal since it was filed yesterday, the Department of Labor has sent to me—and I have already read into the RECORD—their strong objections to the Prouty amendment on the ground first that it fails to stimulate additional or new manpower or development training efforts. Second, it offers a windfall to employers. Third, it does not zero in on the hard core disadvantaged. Fourth, the entire appropriation for the current fiscal year would be expended for reimbursements and grants to employers for wages and training expenses associated with the training of the currently registered apprentices in manpower training and on-the-job training enrollees.

There will be no funds remaining from the amount that would be provided in the amendment, the way it is worded, available for training the hard-core unemployed, because the funds would all go to people presently registered who would be eligible for the money.

I hope the amendment is rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on page 13 of the report, there is a chapter entitled "National Emphasis Programs."

Will the \$200 million be taken out of one of those seven programs which are labeled in the report: One, Headstart; two, Follow Through—what that means, I do not know; three, Legal Services; four, Comprehensive Health Services; five, Upward Bound. So you have three euphonious statements—Headstart, Follow Through, Upward Bound. Will the money be taken from Project Find, another euphonious statement? Out of which program will it be taken?

Mr. CLARK. Nobody knows, because the Senator from Vermont has not told us. Part of it would have to be taken out of those programs. The rest might be taken out of other programs. The Director of OEO is not even authorized to make the decision. The proposed amendment would create a chaotic condition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In describing these programs as Follow Through, Upward Bound, Project Fine, who chose the terms?

Mr. CLARK. I suppose the OEO. They have been in existence for 3 years.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. President, I thought I was being very helpful and fair to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania by not specifying from which programs under title I of the bill these funds should be taken. I thought it was only fair to leave it up to him and other members of the committee to determine where the cuts should be made. I am proposing that the cut be made from the total authorization contained in the bill at page 2.

The proposed amendment is an attempt to meet the increasingly serious problems of structural unemployment caused by a labor force ill-fitted for existing and developing job opportunities. Unlike programs aimed only at the hard-core unemployed, this approach is designed to help both the hard-core unemployed and workers presently employed who seek to increase their skills to qualify for better jobs. The intent of the amendment is to advance all workers up the skill ladder, thus opening vacancies at the bottom for the presently unskilled and unemployed.

The major premise of this approach is that private business and labor have, over the years, learned how to obtain the most results per training dollar, and should now be encouraged to expand their training programs to meet the growing national need.

There was one mistake in the last statement. The proposed amendment does not involve tax legislation. It does involve an authorization, and I believe that those of us who sincerely want to get this antipoverty program on the road and to get people working and self-supporting should take this approach.

Under the Manpower Development and Training Act, the best results have been achieved of any of the training programs heretofore. But we find that much of it, in all of the other aspects, is simply make-work. They are not being trained. They are not acquiring skills. They are getting temporary jobs.

Here, industry would participate. Industry would do its part and would assume the major cost of the expense in so doing.

In a recent issue of the Reporter magazine, an article details much of what industry is already doing in this area. The subject is "Private Industry's Factory Classrooms," and it points out what industry today is doing in order to teach the three R's to its own employees and to employees who may be able, with sufficient training and education, to get and hold decent jobs.

The entire purpose of the proposed amendment is to make this training

program work—it has not been working in many fields—and I believe it is a constructive, realistic approach. On-the-job training is the best means of solving the problem of unemployment.

I hope the Senate will feel in a mood to agree to the amendment. It is highly important that we take this approach, that we get away from the proposals which were used in the 1930's, and that we come up with legislation and an approach which is adapted to the 1960's.

Mr. President, industry can do more to help train the unemployed. Industry knows the needs of the people it employs in its factories and enterprises. Industry is in a far better position to do this than are some of the Washington bureaucrats.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to, because it would be a great step forward and it would accomplish more than has been done thus far.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated. It is opposed by the administration, and it is opposed by a majority of the committee who reported the bill.

I am as much in favor of on-the-job training as is any other Member of the Senate. Three titles in the bill provide for on-the-job training. Most of the money called for by the Senator from Vermont would overlap and duplicate that type of training.

The amendment is disapproved by the Department of Labor, which indicates that its administration would create chaos. Perhaps the most difficult feature of it is that the Senator from Vermont takes \$200 million out of title I of the bill in order to get the money for his amendment, and does not tell anybody where among the dozens of programs in title I the money is to be obtained. The amendment would create chaos if it is adopted by the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I had a discussion earlier with the Senator from Vermont about the \$200 million, and he stated that his intent is that it shall only be deducted from title I to the extent used; but he was unwilling to specify the conditions at the moment, because he wants to be sure that the Secretary of Labor will do his maximum to use it. But the Senator from Vermont would be willing in conference to see that type of approach worked out.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from New York, but may I say that is not spelled out in the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. That is true.

Mr. CLARK. And no authority is given to the administrator to determine where the money shall be cut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the com-

mittee opposed the pending amendment?
Mr. CLARK. I said "a majority of the committee."

Mr. MURPHY. I did not know that it had been presented to the committee.

Mr. CLARK. I have been in consultation with a majority of the members of the committee.

Mr. MURPHY. Outside of committee meetings, that is?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. But this matter has never been presented to the committee? This member of the committee has never had a chance—

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Vermont answer the question? Did the Senator from Vermont propose this amendment or anything like it in committee?

Mr. PROUTY. No. In answer to the distinguished Senator, however, I may say that I did not; but many speeches have been made on the floor of the Senate suggesting this general approach, ever since 1965, when I first offered the Human Investment Act. I believe we had some hearings before one of the labor subcommittees a year or two ago, in which this matter was discussed, but I did not formally offer it in committee.

I point out that the same is true of title II of the bill, which is the Clark amendment. It was offered in committee, but no hearings were held, no witnesses were called, no one had an opportunity even to consider what was in it.

This human investment idea has been considered and discussed for a long time by manpower experts, by industry, and by labor; and in my judgment, I believe that many of the experts in this field—including the Secretary of Labor, if he were perhaps permitted to express off-the-cuff opinions—would agree. The Department of Labor is pursuing this idea to some extent now, and I quoted a statement of the Secretary of Commerce earlier, in which he said that this was a logical approach and that manpower training must be handled to a much larger degree by private industry.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the proposed amendment is a typical example of the folly of trying to legislate on the floor of the Senate when you do not have the amendment until the day before and modify it three times. I hope it will be defeated.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont answer a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas

[Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] would each vote "yea".

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Aiken	Dominick	Percy
Allott	Fannin	Prouty
Bayh	Fong	Scott
Bennett	Griffin	Smith
Boggs	Hansen	Thurmond
Brooke	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Carlson	Miller	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Mundt	
Dirksen	Murphy	

NAYS—57

Anderson	Hayden	Mondale
Bartlett	Hill	Monroney
Bible	Holland	Montoya
Brewster	Hollings	Morse
Burdick	Inouye	Moss
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Nelson
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Case	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Church	Rausche	Randolph
Clark	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Cooper	Long, La.	Russell
Eastland	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ellender	Mansfield	Spong
Ervin	McCarthy	Stennis
Gore	McClellan	Talmadge
Gruening	McGee	Tydings
Harris	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—15

Baker	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Dodd	Hruska	Pearson
Fulbright	Kennedy, Mass.	Smathers
Hartke	Kuchel	Symington
Hatfield	McIntyre	Yarborough

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONTOKA obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. MONTOKA. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the

Senate, there will be no more rollcall votes tonight.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m., tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 344

Mr. MONTOKA. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated. I offer the amendment on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. ANDERSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 46, in line 11, strike out the words "public and" and insert in lieu thereof "Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all available".

Beginning on page 46, at line 23, strike out everything after the period in that line through the period in line 1 on page 47, and insert in lieu thereof "In order to merit financial assistance under this title, a community action agency shall be responsible for and must be capable of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating a community action program, and, to the extent permitted by relevant law, be capable of mobilizing all Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all available private resources."

Mr. MONTOKA. Mr. President, this amendment, which I believe is needed to strengthen and tighten the community action provisions of the pending bill, is extremely simple. It will affect only minor changes in section 202 of the bill concerning the general objectives of the community action programs.

The amendment is a good measure in the fact that it would specifically emphasize the importance to all community action programs of mobilizing, utilizing, and coordinating all relevant Federal, State, and local public resources as well as all available private resources in shaping comprehensive local efforts.

First, the amendment would make this a specific objective of all community action agencies. Second, it would make it clear that every CAP agency would have to have such a capacity, a small capacity to plan, conduct, administer, and evaluate a community action program in order to merit funding or refunding by OEO.

Mr. President, the amendment puts needed emphasis upon the function of a CAP agency as a mobilizer and coordinator of all available public and private resources.

It makes it clear that a CAP agency lacking such a capability would simply be ineligible for OEO funds. Thus, the increased pressure would be put upon CAP agencies to deal cooperatively and

effectively with all levels in government and with all sources of available private support at the local level. The CAA—that is the Community Action Agency, as it is called—or these agencies which are not organized or oriented to such broad cooperating support would have to reform or be passed by.

The OEO would again, under this amendment, have the mandate it needs to assure that all CAA's will have this crucial capacity.

Mr. President, this amendment is both constructive and well-advised. It would strengthen title II of the bill and I urge that it be adopted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. MONTTOYA. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In vesting in the Community Action Committee the authority to spend the funds to be authorized in the Senator's amendment, it will have to coordinate the activities of State and local governments, will it not?

Mr. MONTTOYA. Yes. Under the present system of funding the local CAP committees, there seems to be a habit developing that they are to function only within the OEO program, which is a very limited function. It is my contention, and I think it was the objective of Congress when it originally passed the act, that the CAA group should act as a catalyst for economic development action as well, by marshaling all the resources of the community, public, State, and private, and try to get the other Federal agencies to join in a partnership in this concerted effort for economic development. This they have failed to do. My amendment would put the responsibility upon them. It would constitute a mandate by Congress that they should do this and not confine themselves to being the overseers or caretakers of neighborhood youth programs, the Headstart program, and other programs which are not oriented toward community development.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I fully subscribe to the principle that there should be coordination, but I part with the Senator from New Mexico when we declare that a Community Action Agency should be higher in authority than the State agency and the local government agency in coordinating the activities.

Mr. MONTTOYA. May I inform my good friend from Ohio that that is not the purpose of the amendment. My amendment would not elevate them to a superior authority so that they could tell the other Federal agencies what to do. They would be coequal in what they contribute to an economic development program. What I am saying, with my amendment, is that the Community Action Agency shall be a catalyst to bring these agencies together, not to tell them what to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I subscribe to that, but I merely want to say that I differ with the basic principle of the whole program which assigns to nongovernmental agencies the administration of the taxpayers' funds by individuals who do not have to go before the people and answer for what they have done.

Within what the bill provides, the Senator's amendment is thoroughly

sound and I will support it, but my wish would be that we would place any of these moneys within the administration of duly elected public officials who, when they go wrong, can be defeated at the polls, rather than place them in the hands of selected individuals who have no elected responsibility to the people.

I will support the Senator's amendment because I think it is an improvement of the bill, but I would confine that support to the principle I have just enunciated.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank the Senator from Ohio. May I add that I subscribe to his view also. I understand the committee found acceptable the amendment which I am offering. I wish I could have gone further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to ask the Senator whether he desires his two amendments to be considered en bloc.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have discussed the pending amendment with the Senator from New Mexico and I am content to accept it. I guess there are two parts to this first amendment.

Does the Senator want them considered en bloc? Is that the question the Chair asked?

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, they will be considered en bloc.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, have they both been reported?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been reported.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think the point can be clarified by pointing out that the pending amendment makes two changes in the existing bill and they should be considered en bloc. It is technical.

I am prepared to accept the amendment on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico because the OEO is administratively doing now exactly what the Senator wants to put in legislative language. I think perhaps it is wise to put that in legislative language in order to give the administrators a little bit more of a standard to guide them than perhaps they are exercising in certain parts of the country.

Mr. President, I am prepared to accept the amendment. I am prepared to accept it on a voice vote tonight, but I understand the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is representing the minority, has a few comments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am sympathetic to this amendment. I have little doubt that it will be accepted, but the minority wishes to have a little better opportunity to examine it overnight. I therefore suggest to the Senator that the matter be dealt with ultimately tomorrow.

I am perfectly willing to amend the unanimous-consent agreement which recognizes me so that I may be recognized after the disposition of these amendments. I think the Senator will find that it will work out satisfactorily, and will accommodate a little sentiment over here, in not having further disposition of the amendments tonight.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, in view of the indication of the Senator from New York, I would like at this time to ask unanimous consent at this stage of the proceedings to offer three additional amendments so that they may be printed and considered tomorrow.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, would the Senator wish to have them considered en bloc?

Mr. MONTTOYA. No; they would have to be considered individually.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the right to submit his amendments.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from New York that perhaps more orderly procedure would be to move to set aside the pending amendment in order that the Senator from New Mexico may present his second amendment, which I am prepared to accept, and then that the Senator from New Mexico ask to have his other amendments printed overnight so they can be considered tomorrow.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings under the pending amendment be postponed until tomorrow, or that I be permitted to withdraw them temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to withdraw his amendment. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 343

Mr. MONTTOYA. Now I submit another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 49, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) The Director shall promulgate such standards or rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums, procedures, establishment of committees and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that community action boards provide a continuing and effective mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in programs assisted under this title and that all groups or elements represented on those boards have a full and fair opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those programs."

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, by way of brief explanation of this amendment, it is designed to authorize the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to establish by regulation such standards as will insure majority action on all policy by the community action agencies.

This will insure against a minority in the agency or the lack of a quorum trying to handle important business of the local agency, such as termination of employees or hiring of employees.

Under this amendment there is a mandate to the OEO director that he have such regulations which will insure that the local agency will adhere to a democratic type of proceeding under which the majority and those vested with the majority on the boards shall act, rather than one or two under the pretense that a quorum originally existed at the start of the meeting, and that quorum having been dissipated, two or three or a minority have remained, thus entitling

them to action in that organization at such a meeting.

My amendment is designed to require a majority in the particular proceeding which undertakes any kind of policy action.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am prepared to accept this amendment, which I think merely writes into legislative language the rules and standards which the OEO Director is presently requiring with respect to the orderly conduct of meetings.

I may say, in somewhat lighter vein, that the standards suggested by the Senator from New Mexico are somewhat more rigorous than those which apply in the Senate of the United States; but I think that is a good thing.

Therefore, I am willing to accept the amendment, which may be adopted by voice vote, but I understand the Senator from New York has the same suggestion to make with respect to this amendment as he made to the other amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do have the same suggestion. I would be prepared, depending on the kind disposition of the Senator from New Mexico, to proceed as follows: The leadership would prefer that I speak for the 40 minutes for which I have unanimous consent when we get to the bill tomorrow, and that immediately following, we proceed to debate the two amendments by the Senator from New Mexico, in the following order: The pending amendment and then the amendments which he temporarily withdrew.

If the Senator, for reasons of his own, desires to precede me, I am sure the leadership would not object.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I have two other amendments which I shall submit for printing and will call them up tomorrow.

Mr. JAVITS. The leadership wishes that the Senator follow my 40-minute speech tomorrow, if the Senator has no objection.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I have no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—having consulted with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] about the matter—that tomorrow, following the morning hour and the 40 minutes already allotted to me, the Senator from New Mexico be recognized to call up his last-stated amendment, and when that is disposed of, to call up immediately thereafter the amendment which he temporarily withdrew.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I submit for printing two additional amendments which I intend to take up tomorrow. I also submit an explanatory statement on each of the two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that each amendment and the explanatory statement in connection therewith be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments and explanatory statements of Mr. MONTTOYA are as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 345

On page 48, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after June 1, 1968, a community action program, which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which does not have at least one-third of the authorized places thereon designated so as to afford an opportunity for membership or representation to the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials or their representatives. Failure of those officials to avail themselves of all or part of the places so designated shall not, however, preclude establishment of an alternate board structure which is broadly representative of the community and otherwise consistent with the requirements of this section. The Director may require, with respect to the places designated for occupancy by public officials, that appropriate representation be provided for State or regional agencies, in situations in which a community action agency serves two or more counties."

On page 48, at the beginning of line 15, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 48, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following:

"(d) The remainder of the board shall consist of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community."

On page 48, in line 25, strike out the subsection designation "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONTTOYA IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT No. 345 TO S. 2388, THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

It seems to me that a serious shortcoming in community action programs throughout the country is their failure to extend to elective officials and other leaders of local government sufficient opportunity to participate meaningfully in the direction of these programs.

It is true that OEO's guidelines provide for the inclusion of local officials on the governing bodies of community action agencies. However, this requirement does not have the weight of law, and too often it is difficult to enforce.

The amendment I am proposing would add to the Economic Opportunity Act a specific requirement that at least one-third of the authorized places on the board of directors be designated so as to afford these community leaders the opportunity for membership or representation.

This does not mean, however, that the functions of the agency would be stymied should these community officials refuse to participate or fail to assume the positions made available to them. In that event, an alternate board structure could be established which would be consistent with other requirements regarding the board's constituency and which would be broadly representative of the community.

The amendment also provides that the balance of the board's membership would consist of representatives of private groups and agencies providing assistance to the poor and representatives of business, labor, religious, and other important elements in the community.

I believe that adding these requirements to those already in the bill concerning the representation of the poor on community action boards will go far toward assuring that the governing bodies of community action agencies will include a cross-section of community life and leadership.

It should also enable these programs to gain broader public acceptance and operate

more effectively in helping the poor to arise from poverty and to become part of the mainstream of community life.

Mr. President, I urge that this amendment be adopted.

AMENDMENT No. 346

On page 51, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following new section:

"AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR TO ASSURE COMPLIANCE WITH OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT

"Sec. 216. (a) All individuals serving in positions of trust as members or officers of governing boards of community action agencies, delegate agencies, or other grantees under this title, as well as all individuals serving as officials or employees of such agencies or grantees, shall be expected to adhere to standards of public and private conduct which are fully consistent with the purposes of the Act and with responsible service in the public interests. The enforcement of such standards shall be the primary responsibility of such agencies or other grantees. In the event that the Director finds under procedures which he shall develop, that it would be clearly inimical to the fundamental purposes of this title for any such individual to continue to act in any such capacity, or to become associated with a community action program in any such capacity, the Director shall be empowered to instruct such agency or other grantee to immediately discharge such individual from whatever position he held or not to select such individual for whatever position he was chosen to assume. Any individual adversely affected by an action of the Director under this section shall have the right to petition the Director for a hearing in order to reconsider such action. The decision of the Director with respect to such a petition shall be final.

"(b) In the event of the failure of any community action agency, delegate agency, or other grantee to comply with the decision of the Director in any matter arising under this section, the Director shall terminate all assistance provided under this title to such agency or other grantee."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MONTTOYA IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT No. 346 TO S. 2389, THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The amendment which I am offering would remove a major source of concern and dissatisfaction with the war on poverty, and would constitute a really significant step forward as far as public approval of the poverty program is concerned. Very briefly, this amendment would, for the first time, give to OEO Director Sargent Shriver the authority he needs to make sure that undesirable persons, including advocates of violence and civil disorder, are not permitted to retain positions with local anti-poverty agencies and programs. Under this amendment, OEO would be empowered to direct the discharge of any individual holding any sort of position with a local community action program, whether of a voluntary or salaried nature, wherever the director finds that "it would be clearly inimical to the fundamental purposes of the act for any such individual to continue to act in any such capacity."

Mr. President, the amendment applies not only to the officials and employees (whether professional or non-professional) of community action agencies, delegate agencies, and other community action grantees, but also to members or officers of the governing boards of such agencies or other grantees, however such board members may be selected. The amendment makes it clear that the primary responsibility for enforcing high standards of conduct among community action board members, officials, and employees lies with the local agencies, but that OEO will be authorized to take appropriate corrective action wherever a local agency fails to meet

its responsibility in this regard. As an ultimate sanction to be used in the rare and extreme case where a local agency might defy the director's instruction to discharge an undesirable employee or board member, the director would be obligated, under the amendment, to terminate any and all assistance provided under the Economic Opportunity Act to the agency in question.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that this amendment is seriously needed, to give OEO the authority to exercise some control over situations involving individuals or groups whose conduct or methods constitute a clear threat to the war on poverty as a whole, and whose continued presence in the program cannot on any grounds whatsoever be justified to the American taxpayers, who are, after all, making the war on poverty possible. There is no question of unfairness here: No one can claim any sort of vested "right" to anti-poverty employment of such a nature as to make him immune to disciplinary action for clearly irresponsible behavior or for actions which tend to bring disrepute upon the entire war on poverty. In the case of board members, who all serve without pay, the question of "employment" does not even arise. And the amendment would specifically permit any individual adversely affected by an action of OEO's director under the amendment to petition the director for a reconsideration of his case, and to present evidence in his behalf. The decision of the director with respect to such a petition for reconsideration would be final.

Mr. President, as an example of how this amendment would operate, take the case of Mr. Willie Wright, who is a member of the governing board of the United Community Corporation, the local community action agency for Newark, New Jersey. In the wake of the terrible rioting which struck Newark this past summer, Mr. Wright formed a group called the Community Black Patrol, which roamed the riot area at night. In an interview, Mr. Wright was quoted as saying, "This is what I am advocating around my town: Get yourself a piece of gun and put it in the bottom drawer or something and have it fully loaded and then if some joker breaks into your house like they"—The State Police, he meant—"broke in Plainfield, let them have it." In a subsequent statement, Mr. Wright declared it to be his "firm conviction that complete chaos will have to prevail in the streets of American cities and blood will have to flow like water before the black man will become an accepted citizen of this society." In response to newspaper accounts of Mr. Wright's activities and statements, OEO sought to have the UCC Board suspend him pending an investigation of these reports, and to have the Board immediately disavow sympathy with his statements, and the UCC President, Mr. Timothy Still, stated in response to a reporter's question that he agreed with Mr. Wright's call for Negroes to arm themselves to "defend their homes" against the police. OEO was powerless to act in this case, Mr. President, so that you had a case in which the Federal war on poverty headquarters was forced to sit by while a prominent member of the governing board of a local agency, which has received millions of anti-poverty dollars, could make the most irresponsible and inflammatory statements with complete impunity, and in total disregard of the effect of such actions upon the thinking of the taxpayers who are annually called upon to make the UCC programs possible.

Mr. President, through no fault of OEO or of Sargent Shriver, who has been extremely diligent in seeing to keep undesirable and irresponsible persons out of the various anti-poverty programs, there have been a certain number of other cases in which local agencies have been unable or unwilling to act decisively against those who would pervert or corrupt the laudatory purposes of the Economic Opportunity legislation. That is why

this amendment—or one like it—is needed, and I hope that it will be accepted by the distinguished Manager of the pending bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Clark), then by the Senate, without extensive debate or undue delay.

Mr. President, I know I do not have to say that I offer this amendment in an entirely constructive spirit, and as a firm and faithful supporter of OEO and the President's war on poverty.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contained an interesting and important editorial, very much in point despite its brevity. It is entitled "Mrs. Johnson's Question," and reads as follows:

"If Americans could find satisfactory jobs, amenities and entertainment in rural America would not some of the traffic to the cities be reversed?"

That is the question that Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson asked on her visit to the rural home of Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey. And it is a question that American policy-makers, baffled by the problems of decaying urban centers, must ask themselves with increasing frequency. The answer of course must be: "Yes."

Notwithstanding the fact that more than two thirds of the people live in cities, opinion surveys indicate that two thirds of them would prefer rural homes if they could get jobs and enjoy good living conditions in the country.

Before the Nation proceeds blindly to rebuild its urban ghettos in environments essentially unsuited for human habitation, it ought to carefully explore the feasibility of providing jobs and living conditions that will draw some urban populations into the country—or at least arrest the tide of immigration into cities.

Mr. President, I have been working for several days on an amendment to the poverty program designed to this end. I am aware of the urgent needs and the vast amounts of money that will be and must be expended under the poverty program in our urban centers to reduce the pain and ferment that goes on in the slum areas. I am also aware that it will be of little use to provide inducements to locate new industries and create new plants, if by doing so we only succeed in enticing people to come to those same urban centers, and thus create new and even more crowded ghettos of those who migrate from the country.

I feel it is time for some effective action, while not ignoring the problems of the big cities and the ghettos—and certainly this bill, which appropriates nearly \$3 billion, does not ignore them—to assure that some of that money will be meaningfully spent to provide opportunities, jobs, light industries, training, recreation, and cultural facilities in our rural areas, so that the fine young people who are growing up in our rural areas may have some prospect other than a degrading job and a life in the ferment of crime-ridden slums.

I have been working on this amendment, to try to see if some of the funds so liberally offered to those in the slums—the misfits, the dropouts, and all who need attention—could not be used to do something constructive to help those in the rural areas have an opportunity to make something of their lives, without this immigration to the great metropolitan centers.

I am proposing an amendment, which I hope can be called up tomorrow or the

next day—not increasing in any way the cost of the bill—to transfer \$50 million from the Job Corps into a fund that would be used to devise pilot projects and research programs that would be helpful in retaining our rural population in useful occupations in the rural areas.

The working part of the amendment, after it transfers the \$50 million from the Job Corps, would read as follows:

The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers. Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other Federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project.

Thus, the amendment would transfer \$50 million from a program that is questionable, I believe, in the mind of every Senator as to the value we are receiving—the Job Corps, costing more than \$8,000 per man or woman trained—to a program which will develop opportunities in rural areas without forcing new migrations to the already crowded cities.

Mr. President, that would leave almost a quarter of a billion dollars for this program, and I have great question in my mind that we are receiving any significant yield out of that, even for those who are enrolled in the program. They fail to get enough of their enrollees to stay in the course long enough to make meaningful the tremendous investment of more than a quarter of a billion dollars. I think it is time for us to grant to the Director the right to institute rural programs that will provide job opportunities and hope for these young people where they prefer to live.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I regret that there were not more Senators present to hear the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. It has been my distinct impression also that we are aggravating the problems of metropolitan communities by excessive feeding of money into them, thus encouraging increasing immigration from rural areas into the cities.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The city of Cleveland now has a population of 37 percent of the primary minority group. The more money we feed in there, the greater the immigration will be. A policy should be adopted, and an effort made to put it into effect, that will discourage immigration and aid the solution of employment problems in the local communities, which differ from those in the metropolitan centers.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is entirely correct; and the experience of small industries, once they have tried out rural locations, in every case that has come to my attention, has been uniformly successful when measured in terms of the intelligence of the labor, of the dedication and loyalty of the people to the

job that they hold, and their willingness to give more work than is actually required of them. They respect the great traditions of America, they observe law and order, and they refrain from adding to the flames that have arisen in the recent past, where overconcentration of people in these giant centers has resulted in discouragement and in disorientation from the real purposes and values of American life.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the Federal Government feeds \$5 billion into the metropolitan communities for the purpose of aiding the poor, what will that \$5 billion do toward inducing excessive immigration to the big cities? And, if the immigration is motivated and induced among those that are told that there is \$5 billion available there, will that produce increased population and thus aggravate the problems of the big cities?

Mr. MONRONEY. I say to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio, that I have read many statistics on the cost of the rehabilitation of our cities and the supplying of the necessary housing, schools, neighborhood centers, super highways, and hospitals with which to meet this in-migration.

I have heard some Senators quoted as saying that it will cost \$1 trillion. That is an astronomical figure.

I do not think that we are prepared to go on and on building and making more attractive job offers to those who do not now have the opportunity to choose a job suitable to their talents—those who live and who remain in the rural community.

Their only hope is to go into the pressure areas, the ghettos and slums and the overcrowded industrial centers to take jobs. They lose their identities, their friendships, their school friends, their church connections, and become floating souls without anchors.

I think we must recognize this as a national problem. We must recognize that it will not be solved by dumping more and more billions of dollars into the overcrowded centers to make them attractive to those who cannot find work in the rural parts of America—to induce them to come and take the only jobs available.

For an infinitesimally small fraction of the money that would be required to rehabilitate even a small portion of our slums, hundreds of programs could be established and administered by a wise and able administrator—I think we have one in Sargent Shriver—with an active board cooperating with the present programs of the Government to give meaningful employment to these young people, so that they may live at home, get married, establish a home and go forward with the adjusted way of life to which they have been accustomed and to which they would indeed like to continue.

By transferring the small amount of \$50 million from a program that is already questionable—the Job Corps—and adding it to the \$100 million now available at the discretion of the Director of the OEO, he will be able to set up real programs that will be meaningful and create skills in the rural programs.

I have inspected this program myself, and I say that the rural programs in the

smaller communities are badly in need of refreshing, adjusting, and taking on a new view to do something for the rural areas.

The programs are set up in counties by men and women administrators with salaries that run as high as 25 percent of the total cost of the programs. They do nothing but attend a few meetings in these areas.

The program has been a practical failure because it has not met the real needs of the rural communities.

For that reason, I think we need to reorient the program and not follow so much the pattern of the metropolitan areas.

The Project Headstart is good. That program could very easily be run by the school system. If the Project Headstart could be run by the school system, we would not need all the expensive community action committees in the rural communities which have generated no such programs.

This would give the Director of the antipoverty program the opportunity to call for assistance from leaders of programs that have been successful elsewhere and give our youth who are underemployed or unemployed in the rural areas a chance to find employment near home in developing industry and new opportunity for jobs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there is a natural trend of the people in the rural areas to move into the metropolitan communities. The metropolitan communities have not been able to digest satisfactorily the great immigration that has occurred.

The error of what we are doing is accentuated by the natural tendency of the rural people to move into the metropolitan areas because billions of dollars have been fed into the metropolitan communities and have enhanced the reason for moving there.

Mr. MONRONEY. That program will be self-defeating because it will naturally pull more people into those areas that are already overcrowded beyond correction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Cleveland has been labeled as unfair to the primary minority group. The fact is, however, that in the last 3 years 75,000 more members of the primary minority group have moved into the city. They believe it is good for them and that they will find comfort, economic advancement, and salvation there. The fact is, however, that eventually trouble will be experienced.

I subscribe heavily to the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma. Let us do something to induce industry to establish itself in the rural communities and not in the big communities. If we do, we will, to a substantial degree, solve the problem of the metropolitan area.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate very much my distinguished colleague's comment and his support for the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD the rural opportunity amendment I submitted earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objec-

tion, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 348) is as follows:

On page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "\$295,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$245,000,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike out "\$1,062,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,112,000,000".

On page 68, between lines 12 and 13 insert the following new subsection:

"(d) The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers. Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project."

On page 68, line 13, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 69, line 6, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

On page 69, line 6, strike out "10 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "15 per centum".

On page 69, line 8, after the period insert the following new sentence: "Of the sums appropriated pursuant to this title for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$50,000,000 shall be available only for projects authorized under subsection (d) of this section."

AMENDMENT NO. 349

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD another amendment which would provide that all community action agencies shall have a governing board organized to provide for membership of the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials, or their representatives, of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other majority groups and interests in the community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (349) is as follows:

On page 48, strike out lines 11 through 14 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 213. (a) A community action agency shall be established in order to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program as developed and implemented is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board organized to provide for membership of the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials, or their representatives, of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the amendment would require that locally elected officials be members of the community action agencies to connect up these rambling, floating, indefinite agencies with very little connection and

very little experience in the responsibilities of government, so that they can take a good, fair, hard look at the practicalities of whether a program is worthwhile in the first place or worth the cost or is meeting the needs of the people. It is my understanding that this was recommended by the administration but was not accepted by the committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. The amendment which the Senator from Oklahoma is now proposing is not identical with but is very similar to an amendment which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONROYA] has sent to the desk to have printed. It would be a great service to the committee and to the floor manager if the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from New Mexico would get together on a text on which they could both agree, because their proposals relate to the same subject, although the language is significantly different.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to know that. I was out of the Chamber when the Senator from New Mexico discussed his amendment.

Mr. President, we shall work together and, if possible, centralize on one general set of language.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish the Senator from Oklahoma would give some thought to this. I have great sympathy for the first amendment which he discussed. I think that there is, perhaps, a need to beef up the rural programs. But what concerns me is the taking of \$50 million out of the Job Corps, which is pretty hard pressed now to continue with the servicing of some 42,000 young men and women in the various men's and women's and demonstration camps.

I wonder if the Senator would be receptive, perhaps, to considering overnight whether either we could not add \$50 million to the bill or perhaps give consideration to taking that amount out of title II.

I would be afraid, if we were to take it of the Job Corps, that the administration would be anxious to oppose any cut in the Job Corps authorization.

Mr. MONRONEY. I could not agree to that at all. I think the Job Corps is one of the least effective programs we have. As I recall, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania said it assisted 42,000 youths. I am talking about millions of rural youths. I am asking for only \$50 million out of \$295 million. A quarter of a billion dollars is being left in the bill untouched—\$245 million is being left in the bill for the 42,000 members of the Job Corps.

I do not believe it is paying its way. I do not believe it has proved to be a success.

I have often heard it mentioned—I do not doubt it—that you can send a boy to Harvard cheaper per year than you can to the Job Corps. For that reason, I

visited Job Corps installations in Oklahoma. I have seen the pampering; I have seen the enforced idleness, the lack of dedication, and of morale that goes with it, the desertions, and even the concealment of the number of desertions, which happened in my State.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to get into an argument with the Senator at this late hour.

I can only say that the experience of the members of the committee, both the minority and the majority, with respect to the Job Corps is quite different from that of the Senator from Oklahoma; and I suppose we will have to face this issue on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe we will have to, because I shall be absolutely unwilling to add to the cost of this bill, even though I would like to provide this needed assistance for rural areas.

If you are going to spend \$245 million on 42,000 people who have had, we will say, hard luck or have dropped out or whose mentality may be a little lower, we had better be spending \$50 million on some of the children who are growing up in the rural areas, who are not problem children but will become problem adults if we force them to live the rest of their lives in the ghetto because there is no economic opportunity under the present farm system, with labor-saving devices and mass production, and no possible job opportunity.

Mr. CLARK. I say again to my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, that I do not wish to get into an argument with him at 6 o'clock at night. However, the administration will be strongly opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator; and, under the circumstances, I shall have to oppose it, also, although I would like to see this money go for the purposes the Senator suggests.

Mr. MONRONEY. If we cannot find, out of \$295 million available to run a program for 42,000 delinquent or disadvantaged children, enough money to encourage economic opportunity in rural America, then I believe we would be missing the targets at which we are aiming.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD a telegram I received this afternoon from the Honorable James H. Tate, mayor of Philadelphia and president of the U.S. League of Cities:

I strongly commend you for your leadership as chairman of the Senate's Labor Subcommittee which brought to the floor of the Senate the omnibus anti-poverty legislation Senate Bill 2388. In particular I wish to commend you and heartily support the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 which is incorporated in the anti-poverty legislation. This legislation, which will open up 500,000 new public service jobs among the hard core unemployed, will also provide much needed services in the fields of health, public safety, education, welfare, recreation, neighborhood improvement, reconstruction and beautification programs in our big cities. As you know, when I took forthright action to cut through red tape and put emergency job programs into effect immediately—

That was in Philadelphia, this summer, and probably resulted in preventing rioting in my home city—

I also pointed out that long range solutions to the problems of the slum areas of our cities were urgently needed, and your legislation fulfills this need. As you are also aware, the Urban Coalition, of which I served as a member of the Steering Committee in my capacity as President of the National League of Cities, strongly endorses the principle that the government should become the employer of last resort in exactly the manner provided by your far reaching legislation.

I interpolate that the urban coalition asked not for 200,000 jobs but for 1 million jobs, which would have quintupled the cost of the Emergency Employment Act, increasing it from \$1 billion a year to \$5 billion a year, a step which we in the committee were not ready to take because we thought it was too radical under existing political conditions.

Returning to Mayor Tate's telegram:

I most earnestly hope that the Senate follows your leadership and enacts this program of top priority for our nation's cities which will enable us to carry on to an even greater degree the programs we have instituted in Philadelphia to solve employment, housing, and education problems of our cities.

I point out, for cross-reference purposes, that a similar letter was received from the mayor of Pittsburgh, the Honorable Joseph Barr, who is the president of the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

So that the heads of both of these very important municipal institutions are strongly supporting the emergency employment portion of this bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, when OEO says there is a new Job Corps, they mean neglected youth can now be reached and made into productive citizens largely on their own initiative. All they needed was the opportunity to help themselves. OEO also means that management and other facets of the Job Corps program have been brought in line with the principles of sound business management.

The Job Corps has reduced its man-year cost from \$8,470 in fiscal year 1966 to \$6,950 in fiscal year 1967—an 18-percent reduction. To some, this \$6,950 still seems high, but we must recognize that human renewal today is expensive. The Job Corps is trying to correct the deprivation of the first 15 or more years of a young person's life. The cost amounts to approximately \$465 a year for each year of lost life. A 24-hour-a-day, 7-days-a-week vocational training program, with the associated costs of food, clothing, transportation, and medical bills, cannot be achieved inexpensively.

One may ask what are the alternatives? Do nothing? Put these young people on the dole? Pay the social cost in other ways—riots, jails, and reform schools? In the long run, these alternatives would be more expensive, in dollars and in lost human resources.

How many Job Corpsmen have we heard of participating in riots? How many Job Corpsmen have burned their

draft cards? How many Job Corpsmen were sniping from rooftops? Keep in mind that Job Corps draws from the same population, the same age group, that were swelling the riots in our cities last summer. Instead of shouting "Burn, baby, burn," Job Corpsmen by the hundreds were fighting forest fires, picking up dead fish from the shores of lake Michigan, and undertaking other constructive projects.

What the Job Corps needs and deserves is our recognition that it is proving its worth. The Job Corps wants no new centers, no expansion in capacity, no big changes in direction. All the Job Corps wants is to be allowed to continue to show the way to our lost youth. For the Congress to do otherwise would not just be a rejection of an agency—the OEO—but a rejection of young people who already have suffered rejection by too many.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 27, 1967, at 11 a.m.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued September 28, 1967
For actions of September 27, 1967
90th-1st; No. 153

CONTENTS

Animal care.....24	Flood insurance.....7	Personnel.....6
Antidumping Code.....17	Food services.....33	Poverty.....10
Appropriations.....1,21	Food stamps.....36	Reclamation.....29
Census.....35	Foreign aid.....28	Research.....24
Consumers.....9	Foreign trade	Retirement.....30
Continuing	8,11,13,17,20,23,25,27,32	Roads.....4
appropriations.....1	Forestry.....2	Small business.....5
Cotton.....23	Health.....34	Spending.....14
Dairy.....34	Labor standards.....8	Taxation.....12,15,30
Disaster.....18	Loans.....5	Textile imports...13,23,32
Economy.....15	Log exports.....8	Tobacco allotments.....3
Education.....31	Medical services.....33	Trade expansion.....27
Employment.....19	Mink imports.....20,25	Transportation.....16
Farm program.....22	Natural resources.....26	

HIGHLIGHTS: House recommitted continuing appropriations measure. Senate debated poverty bill.

HOUSE

1. **APPROPRIATIONS.** By a 202-182 vote, agreed to a motion by Rep. Bow to recommit H. J. Res. 849, to continue through October the appropriations for agencies whose regular appropriation bills have not yet been enacted. Under present law their appropriations expire Sept. 30. Prior to the vote on the recommitment motion, Rep. Bow offered an amendment providing that "net aggregate administrative budget expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall not exceed \$131,500,000,000; except by those Department of Defense expenditures beyond \$72,300,000,000 for military purposes that the President may determine

to be necessary" and that "estimated administrative expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 shall be reduced, through the apportionment process, by \$5,000,000,000 (the difference between currently anticipated administrative budget expenditures for fiscal year 1968 of \$136,500,000,000 and \$131,500,000,000)." A point of order by Rep. Mahon, that the Bow amendment was not germane, was sustained. Earlier in the day H. J. Res. 849 had been reported by the Appropriations Committee (H. Rept. 708). pp. H12629, H12556-78

Conferees were appointed on H. R. 9960, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. H12554

2. FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 10442, to facilitate exchanges of national forest land for use for public schools (H. Rept. 716). p. H12629

A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee action S. 1136, to increase the authorization for the forest survey, and S. 219, to sell certain land in Lander, Wyo. p. D860

The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11527, to direct the Department to release a Forest Service tract to the University of Maine (H. Rept. 717). p. H12629

3. TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment S. 1564, to provide for conversion of the national tobacco marketing quota into a national acreage allotment to be apportioned among farms in order to facilitate computation of allotment (H. Rept. 715). p. H12629

4. ROADS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment S. 1467, to authorize appropriations to carry out the highway beautification program (H. Rept. 713). p. H12629

5. SMALL BUSINESS. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1862, to increase the authorization for the Small Business Administration and make various changes in the authorizing legislation. pp. H12578-80

6. PERSONNEL. Received the conference report on S. 1320, to provide for acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees (H. Rept. 718). pp. H12582-3

7. FLOOD INSURANCE. Rep. Boggs spoke in favor of flood insurance legislation. p. H12554

8. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Dent spoke in favor of H. R. 478, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to as to provide relief from certain imports from low-wage areas. pp. H12583-7

Rep. Meeds inserted an article, "Growing Menace of Log Exports." p. H12618

9. CONSUMERS. Rep. Rogers, Colo., inserted an editorial commending Betty Furness' work in behalf of consumers. p. H12596

SENATE

10. POVERTY. Continued debate on S. 2388, proposed Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, and adopted amendments (1) to provide for promulgation of such standards or rules relating to scheduling of meetings and procedures as may be necessary to assure that community action boards have an effective mechanism

Sept 27, 1967

for securing broad community involvement in programs assisted under title II (Urban and Rural Community Action Programs), (2) to provide that a community action agency in order to obtain financial assistance under title II shall be responsible for and capable of planning and administering community action programs, and (3) to set certain requirements for composition and operations of the governing board of a community action agency to insure adequate participation on the part of the poor in the composition of these agencies. pp. S13764-92

Sen. Young, Ohio, urged the expansion of the war on poverty program. p. S13749

Sen. Baker urged private business to help combat poverty and inserted an article, "Heiskell Urges U. S. Companies to Relax Hiring Rules for Poor." pp. S13753-4

11. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Talmadge inserted and discussed several resolutions passed by the Southern Governors' Conference relating to U. S. foreign trade policy. pp. S13755-6
12. TAX SHARING. Sen. Baker inserted a resolution endorsing S. 1236, to establish a Federal tax sharing program. p. S13752
13. TEXTILE IMPORTS. Sen. Hollings inserted an editorial in support of his bill S. 1796, to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles, and Sen. Kuchel was added as a cosponsor to this bill. pp. S13743, S13753
14. SPENDING. Sen. Proxmire criticized the rate of return on government spending and stated, "The use of an unrealistic discount rate in calculating the costs of public works and water resource projects has led to gross overinvestment in these areas." p. S13748
15. ECONOMY; TAXATION. Sen. Hartke disagreed with the proposed tax increase and stated "the imposition of a surtax now would be a mere shifting of a part of the budget deficit from the public to the private sector." He inserted an article, "The Trouble Facing U. S. Tax Levy," in support of his position. pp. S13759-60
16. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Hartke inserted a speech which relates "Some fresh and original ideas on how substantial savings in transportation costs may be achieved through better coordination between railroad and water services." pp. S13762-4
17. ANTIDUMPING CODE. Sen. Hartke expressed his concern with the Antidumping Code signed on June 30, 1967, and stated, "This code clearly is an attempt to amend and emasculate an act of Congress by Executive fiat." pp. S13792-5
18. DISASTER. Sen. Yarborough reported on his inspection trip to Tex. as a result of the disaster caused by Hurricane Beulah, and inserted several letters and reports relating to the emergency needs in this area. pp. S13795-9
19. EMPLOYMENT. Sen. Jordan discussed and inserted a report on "The Employment Effect of Defense Expenditures," including the agricultural industry. pp. S13743-8

20. MINK IMPORTS. Sens. Jackson and Magnuson were added as cosponsors to S. 1856, to amend the Tariff Schedules with respect to the rate of duty on mink imports. p. S13743
21. APPROPRIATIONS. The Daily Digest states that the Appropriations Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 11456, the Department of Transportation appropriation bill, and H. R. 10345, the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill. pp. D858-9

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

22. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Gross stating that "few residents of Iowa and other central Midwestern States are aware of the frightening extent to which these States have been shortchanged as a result of the underpayment to agriculture", and inserting a letter on this subject. pp. A4814-5
23. COTTON. Rep. Dorn inserted an address on problems of the textile industry which suggests possible changes by this Department for the 1968 cotton program. pp. A4823-4

BILLS INTRODUCED

24. ANIMAL CARE. S. 2481 by Sen. Javits and others and H. R. 13168 by Rep. Rogers, Fla. and others, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, ^{S. bill} ordered to lie on the table. (Remarks of Sen. Javits, p. S13742 and Rep. Rogers, pp. H12587-9, H12618, H12624). H. R. 13168 referred to H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.
25. MINK IMPORTS. H. R. 13177 by Rep. Duncan and H. R. 13181 by Rep. Kleppe, to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to Ways and Means Committee. Remarks of Rep. Duncan, p. H12603
26. NATURAL RESOURCES. S. 2475 by Sen. Long, La., to provide for State regulatory jurisdiction over natural resources and services, produced, transported and consumed solely within a single State or off the shore of a single State; to Commerce Committee. Remarks of author pp. S13737-8
27. FOREIGN TRADE. S. 2476 by Sen. Smith and others, to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to establish more effective criteria for a finding of serious injury to domestic industry as a result of concessions granted under trade agreements, to make mandatory the findings of the Tariff Commission with respect to the necessity for tariff adjustment; to Finance Committee. Remarks of author pp. S13738-9

this goal would involve substituting pious words for an effective result.

I could not agree more with these words of Secretary Dulles. Let the Senate translate our lofty rhetoric about the dignity of man into legal reality by ratifying the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

WE MUST WIN THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

(At this point, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our late great President John F. Kennedy once said:

Those who make peaceful evolution impossible make violent revolution inevitable.

It is the responsibility of Congress to make peaceful evolution not only possible but an actual fact and to do this within the framework of law and order. It is legislative weakness to fail to provide adequate programs to attack the cause of poverty, slum housing—the crowding of people into filthy, broken-down tenements and then denying to youngsters born in such surroundings any opportunity or possibility for a decent education and for gainful employment.

Only Federal action on a large scale can strike to the heart of the grave problems facing our urban areas. Heavy additional investments must be made and on an enormous scale in order to overcome the handicaps caused by the deprivations suffered by millions of Americans and to give them opportunities equal to what others have.

Mr. President, our involvement in an ugly civil war in Vietnam, a little country of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States, 10,000 miles from our shores, goes on month after month. Billions of dollars of taxpayers' money has gone up and is going up in smoke. The time is long past due when we must spend huge sums of money to take care of our own.

There are those who say that we cannot afford both guns and butter. I assert that the problems today facing us here at home are of such magnitude that the terms "guns and butter" is no longer even applicable. What we are talking about in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 and the Emergency Employment Act are efforts to solve the serious problem of want amidst plenty which strikes at the very heart of our society. The question no longer is can we afford to solve these problems but rather how soon can we solve them. It is no longer a matter of guns and butter but rather of guns and water, for what the proposed legislation would accomplish is necessary for the very substance of our society.

These programs are not frills and giveaways. They are a serious first step toward bringing millions of ill-housed, ill-fed, poorly clothed, and undereducated Americans into the mainstream of American life.

Mr. President, even the proposals in the pending legislation are only a be-

ginning. Once we extricate ourselves from the miserable civil war in Vietnam, which is draining our national resources, we can get on with the important work of really trying to solve our domestic problems.

The housing program that we have at present is utterly inadequate. The poverty program is too small. The program for schools to replace inferior slum schools is too frequently nonexistent. It is not the riots in the slums, but these lame and inadequate programs that are the real disgrace of the richest nation on earth.

We in Congress must provide hope of employment to young men and women. We must try to give them adequate job training. We must improve the schools. We must improve housing conditions. We must act with determination in providing the money and the planning to rub out conditions in slum neighborhoods which give rise to the ugly rioting which afflicted our cities over the summer and last year. We must be determined in this task.

Mr. President, the pending legislation authorizes the expenditure of three billion five hundred million dollars by the Office of Economic Opportunity and other Federal agencies involved in the war on poverty. This legislative proposal if enacted into law will help create an estimated 200,000 additional jobs during 1968 and 250,000 during 1969. It is designed to help those who need help—Americans with incomes near or below the poverty level who are not able to find jobs in regular competitive employment, and those young men and women with little or no work experience or with a low level of education or with no occupational skills. Let us face it, this is just the beginning—a mere down payment—of what must eventually be invested in programs to restore our cities and to enable all Americans to live in dignity. The longer we delay, the more we procrastinate, the higher the eventual total cost will be.

Mr. President, in the past I have been critical of the administration of some of the programs in the war on poverty, particularly the Job Corps. However, it is encouraging that the committee has included in the proposed bill provisions for closer supervision of the administration of these programs and for greater coordination between the various agencies administering them. This bill is very definitely a needed improvement over previous legislation in this area.

Mr. President, no individual—not a Rap Brown nor a Stokely Carmichael—no one—could cause what happened in Detroit and Newark this year or in Watts 2 years ago, just as no one individual could have stopped what occurred in the 13 colonies in 1776. Those very foolish short-sighted persons who say that the rioting resulted from the war on poverty are 100 percent wrong. Poverty, not the war on poverty, was the basic cause of this rioting.

Some 2,300 years ago the great philosopher Plato termed poverty as the parent of meanness and viciousness and urged that rulers do away with it. He wrote:

It would be strange indeed in any state even tolerably ordered if the poor were to be utterly neglected and allowed to fall into utter destruction.

In attacking the roots of poverty there must be adequate provisions for anti-poverty programs, rent supplements, better housing, a model cities program, a Teacher Corps and for training such as the civilian conservation corps of more than 34 years ago. It is a legislative failure and madness not to enact such measures particularly when we are spending more than two billion five hundred million dollars each month to fight in an ugly civil war in Vietnam.

POCAHONTAS' REVENGE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, any American who has traveled to Central or South America and eaten or drunk tap water there knows what is meant by Montezuma's revenge. This does not compare with what might be called Pocahontas' revenge, for it was the American Indians who introduced tobacco to the settlers from the Old World. Pure nicotine is one of the most potent natural poisons; it is rapidly absorbed through the skin, on which a few drops may be fatal. It is used as an insecticide, and before World War II, more tobacco was consumed in the manufacture of nicotine insecticides than for smoking. Now the situation is reversed. We use other poisons for the insects and reserve the tobacco for ourselves. It is estimated that each year 40,000 Americans die from lung cancer traceable to cigarette smoking. This, in addition to those deaths from heart disease caused or aggravated by smoking.

More stringent Federal regulation of cigarette advertising and sales is necessary to protect millions of young Americans who have not yet caught the smoking habit. I support proposed legislation which would limit cigarette advertising on television and radio to late hours to avoid young audiences, require a stronger warning on cigarette packs, and impose a higher tax on those cigarettes containing high tar and nicotine content.

Mr. President, were tobacco to be introduced today as a new drug, it would be considered poisonous, and its distribution would most certainly be greatly regulated by officials of the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TERRIFIED VIETNAMESE CHILD

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in recent weeks two Cleveland radio and television stations, WKYC, which is an NBC station, and WJW, a CBS station, have been taking polls of their viewers

and listeners on the question, "Do you believe that the U.S. military forces should be withdrawn from Vietnam now?" Station WJW received more than 14,000 telephone calls and announced that 59.5 percent voted for withdrawal of our Armed Forces from Vietnam with 40.5 percent voting against. Then, shortly after this poll had been taken over WJW's Channel 8, WKYC, the NBC station, asked this same question of its viewers and listeners. Officials of television station WKYC reported that 72 percent of those telephoning or writing the station announced themselves in favor of withdrawal of our Armed Forces from Vietnam and only 28 percent were opposed.

Just recently, on Walter Cronkite's television broadcast, David Schumacher quoted a colonel of the U.S. Marines in combat in the northerly part of South Vietnam. The Marine colonel said:

The people around here all hate us and you can hardly blame them. We burn down their huts, run our half-tracks over their rice fields to destroy their crops, then send them to refugee camps in some other part of their country.

There was also recently published in our newspapers a picture of a marine in combat directly south of the demilitarized zone separating North and South Vietnam. He was tying a blindfold over the eyes of a Vietnamese boy of 10 years of age who had just been captured by our Marines. One hundred and fifty dollars in money was found on the little boy. It was charged that the little fellow was either a terrorist or a VC and the money found was proof of that. The boy explained that his father had just sold his entire rice crop and had given the youngster the money to keep, believing that our soldiers would not search such a small youngster. The terrified boy was searched, blindfolded, and his hands tied behind him. Yes, it is said that the boy's father has fled from the area of the demilitarized zone and has joined the VC, or forces of the National Liberation Front.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PRAISED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I was happy indeed to note in the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily Times September 22 a lead editorial entitled "Courageous Agency," paying tribute to the remarkable work which has been done in Alaska by the Small Business Administration. I ask unanimous consent that that editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is not only that the Small Business Administration has come to the assistance of Alaska in two notable disasters, the earthquake of 1964 and the flood which inundated Fairbanks and Nenana and Minto just a few weeks ago, but additionally and very importantly, the SBA has been a steady supplier of capital for Alaska's economic growth. It is my per-

sonal opinion that Alaska is particularly fortunate to have as its regional administrator, Robert E. Butler. It is my opinion, come by after close observation over a considerable period of time, that Mr. Butler is one of the most efficient administrators I have ever known in the Federal Government.

After the earthquake, Eugene P. Foley, then Administrator of the Small Business Administration, took an active personal interest in the recovery of Alaska and he was there on many occasions. In the latest disaster, Robert C. Moot, now Administrator, and Clarence Cowles, Director of the Office of Disaster Loans, have performed noteworthy and notable and helpful service. We in Alaska are grateful to the SBA.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, Sept. 22, 1967]

COURAGEOUS AGENCY

There ought to be an outstanding award for the Small Business Administration in Alaska. It should be presented, with fanfare and ceremony for all to see, by the entire state and more especially the citizens of Anchorage and Fairbanks.

This agency is the hero in the "rescue" operations that revived the state's two largest cities after disasters, Anchorage after the earthquake in 1964 and Fairbanks after the flood of last month.

Many federal, state, and local government agencies and private organizations came to the aid of the stricken cities and many rendered memorable service. But most of them were doing the job for which they were created.

The Small Business Administration did more than that. Rule books and established procedures were inadequate in these two disasters. So the books were thrown out and procedures were dumped. The leaders made innovations in policies and shortcuts in procedures to meet the need.

This required vision, courage and confidence. People in government service rarely enhance their careers by throwing out rule books, innovating or taking shortcuts.

Residents of these two cities will be grateful forever for the vim, vigor and verve of the Small Business Administration.

In Anchorage, the agency liberalized its policies and rules for making loans to repair the homes and buildings damaged in the earthquake. Within a year the agency had approved 628 home loans totalling \$12.2 million and 642 loans to commercial enterprises totalling \$51 million, and had actually disbursed \$52.2 million.

This was the credit that enabled families to continue to live here. It was the credit that enabled business places to re-establish their operations and provide the goods and services the people required.

In Fairbanks the agency responded to the pressing needs for haste because of the approach of winter and the different conditions resulting from a flood.

Shortly after the flood waters had receded, the Small Business Administration was in full operation with a program that the city needed and could get nowhere else. The agency offered unsecured loans up to \$3,000 to anyone who had flood damage and announced that additional credit would be available for those who required it.

This enabled the residents to act immediately to clean up and fix up their properties before the cold of winter moved in and made repairs impossible. The decision to increase the amount of the unsecured loans upset the normal ceiling of \$1,000 and exceeded the expectations of the people of Fairbanks. The agency had been asked to

grant \$2,500 loans and, via telephone from Washington, the ceiling was set at \$3,000 the same day the request was made.

Who could ask for more cooperation or faster action?

Even without the distinction earned in the two disasters the Small Business Administration is worthy of special recognition. The agency is a source of credit and, like every frontier, this frontierland needs credit on liberal terms. Small business loans have enabled many new enterprises to come into being to provide goods, services and employment in places where all three have been sorely lacking.

Credit has always been hard to find in Alaska. For 90 years as a territory, this area had virtually none. Nobody would loan to a peculiar place that was run by a czar called the Secretary of the Interior.

Since statehood, capital has been interested in a limited sort of way. Things are better and the future looks still better.

But all would be different had the Small Business Administration not made it possible for Anchorage and Fairbanks to come back from their disasters. Deterioration in their economies would have led to a shriveling of the transportation systems and all the commercial establishments that supported them. Population would be less. Demands would be less. Life would be a step or two back toward the isolation and hardships of a generation ago.

A major part of the success in overcoming the two disasters must be attributed to the vision, courage, and efficiency of the Small Business Administration.

THE PEACE CORPS IN KOREA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, earlier this year, while in Korea as a representative of the United States at the inauguration of President Park, I met and visited with a number of U.S. Peace Corps volunteers serving in that country. As in other countries I have visited, I found these Americans, headed by their outstanding Director, Kevin O'Donnell, doing very necessary, dedicated, and much-appreciated work.

Peace Corps in Korea is now 1 year old. Recently, Mr. O'Donnell wrote me, setting forth future plans and enclosing articles from Korean English-language newspapers on the occasion of Peace Corps' first anniversary in Korea. I believe that Senators will want to read the letter and the articles and will do so with pride. I therefore ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1967.

HON. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: As Peace Corps completed its first year in Korea, the English Language newspapers noted our anniversary. Having visited us in Korea during this first year, we thought you might be interested in reading these news stories, so we would like to share them with you.

The next four months will see PC/K expand greatly. In October about 90 more Volunteers will arrive to teach English in the Middle Schools (Junior High). In December, 100 Volunteers are due. This will be the first group of Rural Health Auxiliaries who will assist the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs in opening and staffing Health Sub Centers at the Myon (county) level. The MHS has a five year program of taking Health Services out into the rural areas.

services together as a single system in which the traffic is permitted to move by the most efficient routing, cost and service factors considered.

For as long as I can remember, the transportation experts have been dissatisfied with the ability of the transportation industry to fit together the cost and service advantages of the different modes. Imagine a computer equipped with critical information as to the service characteristics and true comparative efficiency of the different modes and capable of making impartial recommendations as to the routing of traffic. It is the opinion of the experts that if routing decisions were made objectively, the traffic pattern would be very different and the nation's freight bill much less. They have been particularly concerned that the potential economies of water and rail coordination have been under-utilized.

The nation's rivers are strategically located to supplement the rail networks on major movements of coal, grain, fertilizers, steel, chemicals, metallic and non-metallic ores, petroleum products and a long list of other basic commodities which move in quantities of millions of tons. The east-west main line of the Ohio River system connects with the main north-south line of the Mississippi River. Including the Missouri River, the low cost water highway extends almost from the Canadian border to the Gulf and from the Appalachian mountains to the Rockies to provide an economical adjunct to rail service for the mid-America region. Great Lakes, coastwise and intercoastal services and other river and canal systems provide equally strategically located supplements to the efficient overland rail network.

In an economy in which rising costs of materials and wages are becoming a matter of increasing concern, intensive utilization of low cost water transportation provides a major opportunity to achieve substantial savings in production and distribution costs for both industry and agriculture.

The simple fact is that freight can be transported by water at a fifth to a half of the cost of transporting it overland. Fitting this capability into the distribution pattern is an important objective of any cost-conscious traffic manager.

The opening up of new water-rail routes could save the economy millions of dollars in transport costs. This in turn would benefit consumers through lower prices, contribute to slowing inflation and improve the nation's ability to compete in foreign markets.

Apart from these considerations, there is a growing concern with the continued effectiveness of healthy competition in stimulating new investment in improved transport services. As the super-railroads are formed from the mergers, shippers are increasingly finding competition diminished. A water-rail route equal to or greater in efficiency than the all-rail route can often supply that practical competitive alternative so necessary to healthy progress.

Much more intensive use of ocean, Great Lakes and river highways for domestic commerce in combination with rail is, I believe, an idea whose time has come.

I do not mention water-truck coordination simply because this is now so good that there is little room for improvement. Wherever water service requires the supplement of truck service, the connection is readily available. The truck lines and the water carriers work in friendly harmony in developing new traffic and improving the service.

But rail-water coordination is dominated by out-moded tradition, unfriendliness in business relationships and a vast ignorance of capabilities of combined rail and water service.

The barriers standing in the way of opening up new water-rail routings seem to most observers to be largely artificial. William H. Tucker, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, said last month: "I sug-

gest that each of the various carrier modes suffers from a severe case of channel-mindedness, continually fortifying their modal fences, boundaries and prerogatives." As you know, the Commission is proposing new legislation for through route and joint rate authority. But Mr. Tucker recognizes that—and I quote again—"the real impetus for this change should have come from the transportation industry itself."

It is never too late to try the voluntary route. We can perhaps take heart from the fact that in the early days of regulation, the same channel-mindedness dominated relations between railroads. The railroads were once just as hostile to each other as they have recently been to the water carriers. The most difficult single problem seemed to have been the lack of friendly businesslike relationships.

Two paragraphs from the ICC's Annual Report for 1888 tell the story. They could have been written to describe the intermodal climate in 1967.

"An impartial observer is compelled to say that the methods so frequently resorted to for the remedy of supposed grievances or for the punishment of supposed wrongs are methods which do not belong to the present age . . . To make the adversary feel and fear the power to inflict injury is often the first and principal thought, and a rate is cut when in a ruder age it would have been a throat."

And again:

"But the evils arising from the want of a friendly business relationship between the railroads fall largely upon the public also . . . The difference between performing the legal duty grudgingly, though to the letter of the bond, or on the other hand performing it in an accommodating spirit and with the purpose to make the service as valuable as possible, may in some cases be the difference between a general annoyance and a great public convenience. A short road may sometimes make itself little better than a public nuisance by simply abstaining from all accommodation that could not by law be forced from it."

A recent Department of Commerce study of intermodal coordination directed by Professor Merrill J. Roberts of the University of Pittsburgh suggests that some railroads today may well be making a "public nuisance" of themselves in this context. The study notes, and I quote: "Railroads have been markedly reluctant to cooperate with barge lines in establishing coordinated services."

But as well as stating the problem, the study may also have provided the clue to the answer. Elsewhere the study notes this important fact: "The railroads' traditional orientation has been to output and sales. Recently, however, they have been forced in the direction of profit orientation by competitive pressures."

Perhaps the brightest prospect for better coordination may well be the old and reliable profit motive. It has been traditional thinking among railroads that a rail-water connection is somehow bad for the railroad. On significant movements of coal, fertilizers, grain and phosphates, some movements have recently been developed which yield particular railroads new and profitable traffic. Under such circumstances, there is an opportunity to overcome traditional reluctance. The water carrier, however, often has difficulty getting a hearing in the first place.

An effective barrier to a more efficient rail-water movement which results in substantial savings to the customer is sometimes the regional rate bureau. A proposed rate, profitable to the proposing railroad, may be seen by another member of the rate bureau as a threat to a "rate structure." The affected railroad will make sure the rate proposal is voted down in the bureau meeting.

I know of a number of such instances. Last year a major railroad proposed a rate reduction on bauxite ore between St. Louis

and Mexico, Mo. to connect with a barge movement from the Gulf. The Western Trunk Line Committee turned the proposing railroad down because it believed the new rate would seriously affect the all-rail movement from Mobile and possibly other sources.

That a barge-rail movement which is demonstrably economic and efficient for shippers and carriers alike, and needed and wanted by both, can be frustrated under these conditions suggests the need for reform of the system.

Competition based on superior efficiency is in the public interest, but competition which succeeds simply because a rate bureau has the naked power, as the ICC in 1888 suggested, of a "ruder age" is something else again. Blocking a more efficient route would seem to me to be an abuse of a rate bureau's function.

Recently, the Milwaukee railroad attempted to make itself competitive on the large volumes of corn and soybeans gathered into upper Missouri and upper Mississippi River crossings by truck. It proposed substantial reductions between points on its line to encourage rail-barge movements via river ports including Davenport and Sabula, Iowa on the Mississippi River and Council Bluffs on the Missouri. The rate bureau knocked out the proposal. Again a more efficient route was blocked despite the public benefits to the farmers and shippers of the water-rail coordination.

Veterans of the water-rail coordination battle know that the railroads sometimes use other sanctions. If a shipper gets too interested in a more efficient water-rail routing, mention is made of the difficulties he may have getting supplies of freight cars. Similarly, if a railroad gets too interested in promoting a profitable rail-water movement, someone politely mentions that connecting railroads may retaliate by re-routing important traffic over other rail lines. These are tactics of a "ruder age." One has to assume, however, that there is no nationwide conspiracy of the railroad industry to block water-rail movements and that efficient utilization of the nation's transport resources is a goal to which the railroad industry subscribes. The basic assumption must be that self-interest of individual railroads, shipper requirements for more economical movements, and the obligation and desire to provide the public with efficient services are forces which can be relied upon just as much in this segment of the economy as they can be relied upon in every other segment of the economy.

It is customary in these forums to talk theory and generality. I am departing from that tradition in citing these specific examples where rail and barge lines jointly wanted to improve water-rail coordination and are frustrated by the rate bureau. There are many other specific cases where a water-rail service would result in substantial savings to shippers and consumers. I suggest that intensive new studies be instituted on potential water-rail movements to uncover possible new examples.

Such movements should meet these criteria.

a. A reduction in the overall rate for the shipper or receiver.

b. An equally efficient water-rail service having the advantage of providing shipper and receiver with a competitive routing.

c. At least the same revenue for the railroad as received from the all-rail connection.

d. Expense of transfer at the intermediate water-rail connection to be counted as part of the water-rail rate.

Among the most fruitful fields of enquiry could certainly be the movements of manufactured iron and steel products. On field pipe is a good example. Water service from the Pittsburgh area to Kansas City or Memphis combined with rail service at a rate equivalent to the rail revenue from the all-

rail route would provide savings of about \$3 a ton to receivers in Oklahoma and Texas. Many such instances might even permit a larger revenue for the connecting railroad and still provide the shipper with a very substantial reduction. Similar savings can be shown on water-rail movements of other steel products out of Pittsburgh to the West.

A study of the grain gathering rates would probably show the potential for large savings over present exempt truck charges. A gathering rate which attempts to block access to the river crossings simply encourages alternative means of reaching the rivers. Low cost water service is too valuable to be destroyed by such tactics. Such studies should determine whether barge lines, grain terminals, or shippers or a cooperative combination of all three, would do well to think in terms of "renting a train," as recently proposed by the Illinois Central, to perform shuttle gathering services for river crossing elevators.

Why should the railroads cooperate? First, encouragement of the most efficient routing means more business for everyone. As a matter of enlightened self-interest, cooperation may well be the best road to maximizing profits. Second, in the long run, shippers won't pay the higher rates. The interior industries will simply move to the waterways. Third, failure to develop a reasonable connecting service between rail and water common carriers simply encourages further shipper investment in private carriage.

We could be here until Christmas listing all the reasons the railroads may never cooperate in developing efficient water-rail services. But one objection of the railroads is worth a comment. They complain vigorously of the present law which specifically forbids them to own a water carrier, the so-called Panama Canal Act. The law was passed because so many water carriers on the Great Lakes and in the coastwise and intercoastal trades seemed to disappear shortly after having been acquired by railroads. Since then, though railroads have attempted at various times to acquire water carriers, they have never been able to persuade anyone that rail ownership would not mean sudden death for the water carrier industry.

A major factor, I suggest, in the present impasse on the ownership question is ignorance of the water carrier business on the part of the railroads. If they knew more about the economic potential of water transportation, and had a record of cooperation with water carriers in opening water-rail routes where such routes provide more efficient or equally efficient transportation services as the all-rail routes, the water carriers, the shippers and the Congress might feel differently about railroad ownership.

Perhaps, if railroads and barge lines were free to invest in each other's businesses, considerably short of control, but sufficient to serve as an incentive for understanding each other's problems, potentials and mutual interests, more progress could be made. There might even be an exchange of directorships, between a barge line and a railroad.

This might require Commission approval, but an experiment designed to promote better coordination of service through this sort of mutual educational exchange might be cordially received by the Commission and the Congress if both railroad and barge line asked for it. The question of control could then be taken up after a five year experimental period and progress in opening rail-water routes reviewed.

The long dispute over common ownership has tired everyone. The public is interested in concrete results demonstrating more economical use of transportation resources. I have proposed the opening up of new water-rail routes. I have proposed an exchange of directorships for educational purposes.

While anyone in transportation is, by definition, an optimist, or he would not be in the business, I know that change comes slowly

and in small steps and that in transportation, as in any business, tradition counts for more than new thinking. A. N. Whitehead, the philosopher, put it well when he said: "We cannot think first and act afterwards. From the moment of birth we are immersed in action, and can only fitfully guide it by taking thought."

Perhaps we can fitfully guide a move in the direction of opening up more efficient use of transportation resources by sensible water-rail combinations. I'm certainly willing to try. After all, the old hostilities are both artificial and unbusinesslike.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

Under the previous order, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have requested this time today in order to marshal the arguments for what I consider to be the essential elements of the pending bill.

Certainly, one of the major issues before us is the question of money. The pending bill would add \$198 million to the antipoverty program for fiscal 1968, with most of that going to special private enterprise projects, which are my special care and concern, and for which I shall urge support in these remarks to the Senate. It would also add, over a 2-year period, \$2,800 million for the new Clark-Javits emergency jobs amendment.

The first question that arises is national priorities then, why should we appropriate this amount of money—well in excess of \$2 billion under title I, and a 2-year program amounting to \$2,800 million under title II—at a time when we are being pressed for economy, and when we have problems financing the war in Vietnam?

My answer to that question, Mr. President, is that a proper view of our national priorities requires it. We are giving first national priority to the war in Vietnam. I say that is proper. It is a war, and whatever may be my views on it—and it is not appropriate to discuss them at this moment—we must pay for it, and it is entitled to the first priority if for no other reason than because it involves the lives of our servicemen overseas. Its cost is \$2 billion a month, roughly speaking—which is, in round figures, something like 20 percent of the Federal budget.

But when we get beyond that, then what, Mr. President? It is at that point that I feel we have a right to argue as to what we feel the order of national priorities should be.

In my judgment, the next national priority immediately after the Vietnam war is the crisis in the cities. Let us economize at the expense of other programs which do not bear on this crisis in the cities; but let us not undercut the programs which are our best assets in that struggle.

In the antipoverty and emergency employment legislation the Senate has before it the most critically important bill of the year to avert a winter of discontent and another summer of violence.

Mr. President, notwithstanding this fact, the administration, in my judgment, has been remiss in its estimate of the national priorities. The President took a very strong stand when it came to a \$20 million rat control bill, but we find now, however, that the White House is on the other side when we propose a job program of a size calculated to have some real impact on the problem. And that statement goes for the provisions of the antipoverty title itself, title I, and the \$198 million which I have described, as well as for the provisions of the emergency employment bill, title II.

In both cases, it is by now no secret that the administration has been neutral or against the expanded effort rather than in favor of it.

It seems to me that this represents a downgrading of the priority to which the cities are entitled by virtue of their crushing problems.

NEW PRIVATE ENTERPRISE PROGRAMS

Mr. President, I should like to analyze and urge the Senate to approve this \$198 million in authorization which has been added in title I.

The bulk of this new money, \$118 million, is earmarked for three new program innovations sponsored by me which relate directly to private sector participation in the war on poverty. And this is money that should have an important multiplier effect in terms of stimulating added private investment in the antipoverty programs.

It would be a mistake to suppose that there is slack in the President's request of \$2.06 billion to permit these programs to be carried out even if the committee's request is cut back to the budget figure. By and large, the budget figure involves no money for the expansion of programs—for example, Headstart will receive the same amount it got last year, and the Job Corps will get less than it actually expended last year. If we want to get private enterprise into the war on poverty, it is going to take this new money.

The first of these new programs is in many ways the most exciting. Section 123(a) (8) of the bill, added at my initiative, establishes a new program of incentives to private industry to hire and train the hard-core poor. We have received numerous reports in the committee that the present incentives are not sufficient to encourage private firms to hire these workers, who generally require substantially more education and training be-

fore they become productive. Typically, under the on-the-job training program within the Manpower Development and Training Act or the Neighborhood Youth Corps, only a maximum of \$25 a week is allowed to the employer to cover extra training expenses. Not only is this amount often inadequate to cover the costs of training, but it in no way reimburses the employer for the lower productivity of the new worker. Nevertheless, the Department of Labor reports that on-the-job training is particularly effective where employers are willing to join the program, since, first, it results in almost certain placement, second, insures that the worker is being trained in a skill which is related to his later employment and is being trained according to the employers' own preferred techniques; and third, is directed toward placing workers in careers in the private sector rather than in Government work.

The measure which I have suggested therefore builds directly upon the concept of on-the-job training and makes it practical in industrial terms for business to take on more on-the-job trainees.

There have been other suggestions offered in recent years to encourage private industry to take on more of the manpower training effort. The Human Investment Act, of which I am a cosponsor, seeks to do this by providing a tax credit for a certain percentage of training costs. The Labor Department has constantly opposed this approach, however, on the ground that it would get the Internal Revenue Service into the business of overseeing training programs and would be too inflexible in its operation.

I believe this new approach overcomes those objections. First, the operation of the program will be lodged in the Labor Department, under a delegation agreement from the OEO. Second, it allows maximum flexibility so that the Secretary can tailor the inducements on a case-by-case or industry-by-industry basis, providing no more than is necessary to do the job. One of the difficulties with a tax approach is that it establishes a fixed subsidy not variable according to specific situations—a subsidy which may later prove to be too big or too small in actual operation.

Under this new section in the bill, the Secretary would provide reimbursements to establishments for the added costs attributable to hiring these workers, including such costs as those of on-the-job counseling and training, company transportation to and from ghetto areas, and the costs of sending recruiters into slum or depressed rural areas.

It also allows the Secretary of Labor to reimburse employers for limited periods of time when an employee might not be fully productive. Under this rubric, costs such as those of spoilage of work or of down-time on machines could be reimbursed. This is not a subsidy of normal operating costs, but rather a reimbursement of abnormal costs incurred by hiring the untrained and badly educated. The Secretary would also have authority to provide further financial incentives if the reimbursement of added costs alone were not enough; for example, he might negotiate contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-

fee basis for the training and employment of persons specified by him.

The program is established on an experimental basis for the first year—\$10 million in new funds was added specifically for this purpose, though the committee report makes clear that the Department is expected to allocate at least \$15 million during fiscal year 1968 for these activities. I am hopeful that as this approach is worked out, we can slowly replace many of the classroom training programs now in use by the Government at great per capita cost.

One of the objections the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] made to this provision of the bill when he spoke on his amendment yesterday was that this would have to be a community action program effort and would have to have a community action agency to carry it out.

I wish the RECORD to show that that statement is not accurate since two provisions of the law state that the Director of OEO may handle programs of this nature directly if he finds that it is ineffective to do it through a community action program—and those are sections 122(b) and 123(c) of the bill which is before the Senate.

(At this point, Mr. HART assumed the chair.)

Mr. JAVITS. The second program in the private enterprise category, for which some \$83 million was added to the budget request of \$22 million, is the so-called Kennedy-Javits special impacts program found in title I-D of the act. Many of the changes in this program have come about by virtue of a bill which I introduced entitled "The Business and Industrial Development Act," S. 2203, on August 2, 1967.

The economic development aspects of that bill were separated in committee from the small business provisions, and Senator Kennedy and I jointly worked the economic development aspects of my bill into the special impacts program. Many of these changes were, in fact, within the intent of the special impacts program as enacted last year, but were not implemented by the Department of Labor. Thus, we have now specified that incentives may be provided to business to locate in or near eligible slum and depressed rural areas in order to provide jobs for persons in those areas.

Unlike the program now in the act, the new version of the special impact program recognizes that rural areas must also be covered, since out-migration from these areas is one of the key causes of urban poverty, and that all installations need not be located in the areas themselves, so long as they provide employment for area residents. Thus, it may be preferable, from the point of view of land availability and relocation costs, to place an industrial plant outside the slum and then reimburse a company for providing transportation for its workers.

Other new provisions added to the special impacts program are a requirement that emphasis be placed on developing ownership and managerial skills among the poor themselves, and an application of other Federal resources under urban renewal and the Economic Development Act to the special impacts package. We

contemplate that the economic and small business development aspects of the new program will be delegated to the Department of Commerce.

The third of the new programs encompasses \$25 million for small business counseling and technical assistance, to be administered by the Department of Commerce. Under this program, special effort is to be devoted to urban ghetto areas and to using the full resources of the private sector to provide business counseling and training. Thus, the bill looks toward the development of an on-the-job-training program for new entrepreneurs in existing businesses, and provides incentives to business to award subcontracts to enterprises in slums and ghettos and to aid in the upgrading of these potential subcontractors.

EMERGENCY JOBS BILL

The next major section of the bill which warrants our attention is the Emergency Employment Act, or the Clark-Javits bill as it is called. I might point out that my name being on the bill is fortuitous, as the bill originally was Senator CLARK's creation. My contribution was in fashioning it to give the maximum encouragement to private enterprise, and to provide for authorization to use the funds for supportive education and training.

The Emergency Employment Act provides the most direct approach to the problem of poverty and the crisis of the cities. Unlike education or housing programs, or the model cities approach, job creation and employment activity have an immediate impact in alleviating poverty. They provide money in the pocket and self-respect, and have a multiplier effect as the new money buys products and services for the employees.

Everywhere our subcommittee went we heard the same judgment—"Jobs are first," "What we need are jobs." And by providing jobs we can affect the climate in the cities before next summer, before the frustrations of poverty again break out. This is not legislating at the point of a gun; rather, it is doing what is morally right and what is pragmatically needed by this country. Let us not ignore frustration and degradation simply because it has become so acute that it has pushed a small minority into violence. What irony that would be—for Congress to refuse to do more because the situation is getting worse. In this bill, the Senate has major opportunity to do something constructive to avert a replay of this summer's outbreaks. Let us recognize the crucial nature of this bill—this is our major opportunity and perhaps our last chance to do something in time.

Some oppose this bill because they think it will simply be makework. I reject that argument. Public service jobs need not be makework; the report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress estimated that there were over 5 million public service jobs which could be usefully created. Governmental and public service jobs are the fastest growing employment category in this country. There is a very great need for new subprofessional supportive personnel in the hos-

pitals, schools, police stations, and community service centers of the country. Tens of thousands could be employed in physical rehabilitation of our slums. Our city and national parks are being inundated under the pressure of a burgeoning and travel-conscious population—conservation and beautification personnel are in tremendous demand.

So the need is there—there is no necessity to create worthless jobs. And we have now several programs in operation which provide models for the implementation of this new effort, programs from which many lessons in job creation have been learned and from which most of the bugs have been shaken out. For example, the Nelson amendment program has been in existence for 2 years as a job creation effort in conservation work, largely for the elderly, the new careers program under the poverty act has been creating new job opportunities for the poor as aides in the public service professions, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps has served millions of youths by creating jobs in both public and private employment.

Moreover, Mr. President, this bill is not restricted to public service jobs—though the opportunities in that respect are very great—because it also allows the payment of training and employment incentives to private firms for the creation of job opportunities in other fields. This is what I spoke of when I referred to my own contributions to this emergency legislation.

Others oppose this emergency employment title because hearings were not specifically held on it. But, Mr. President, we held months of hearings on the causes of poverty and the solutions to the problems of the slums and ghettos. No more witnesses are needed to prove that jobs are the number one priority. The figures literally cry out for relief on that score. I should like to cite a few figures.

For example, a survey by the Department of Labor in November of 1966, based on 10 slum areas, showed the unemployment rate in these areas was about 10 percent, or three times the average for the rest of the country; one of every five of those slum residents working full time was earning an income below the poverty line; at least a fifth of the adult men could not even be found in the surveys, and their employment status was unknown; "subemployment" in these areas, measuring joblessness, nonparticipation in the labor force, and earnings below the poverty line, averaged 34 percent, varying from 24 percent to 47 percent; the most serious single problem was perhaps that of unemployment among nonwhite teenagers—now averaging 30 percent; and the employment gap between white and nonwhite teenagers is increasing, though the gap for adult males is narrowing.

It is for that reason I say that no more witnesses are needed to prove that jobs are the No. 1 priority. Three Presidential commissions have asserted the need for a Government job-creating program of massive dimensions. I submit that hearings are just as effective to support a bill even if not held with reference

to a specific bill number where those hearings cover the subject matter fully.

Perhaps the Emergency Employment Act could be more refined and more detail added, but legislative perfections should give way to the necessity of doing something before next summer. And it takes a while for any such program to get geared up. The Department of Labor has models—as I have pointed out—under which to work. The Congress could refine the program next year, but we should not deprive ourselves of the urgent need for this tool because of a fictitious belief that hearings have not been held. They have been held on the problem.

THE NEED FOR AN OEO

Mr. President, I shall conclude with a word about the vital issue before us—that of the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity itself. As my colleagues know, the agency is the target of a bill offered in the House of Representatives which would dismember it and parcel out its functions to other departments. In this body, we will be presented with a number of amendments to transfer at least some of its programs. The question is whether we are best advised to continue OEO, or by depriving it of essential parts of its activity to gradually dismantle it or make it into a staff agency at the White House level or otherwise.

I think ultimately it is right and proper that the Office of Economic Opportunity should be a staff agency, perhaps like the Office of Mobilization in the executive branch, riding herd for the President on the war on poverty activities in various traditional operating departments.

However, the time is not now and if we tried to rush the process we would do two things: First, we would dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity; and, second, we would end up by destroying the impact of programs which have been carried on under the heading of war on poverty.

The essential argument in the minds of many who would urge us to do that is the primitive proposition that we have gotten along without a war on poverty so long, why can we not get along without it now and instead merely beef up education, child care, juvenile delinquency programs, and a few other things. This argument, Mr. President, assumes that life stands still and that there could never be a time when this great and influential society would at long last endeavor to perform the miracle which has not been performed in any other society in recorded history of setting its hand to the elimination of poverty.

There had to come a historic moment, within a nation which has mustered the resources which we have to undertake to eliminate poverty for those who do not wish to live under it if given half a chance and half a choice. That is what it comes down to: given half a chance and half a choice.

Do they desire to live under those conditions? We believe they do not, but they have not had the opportunity or choice, and that is what the war on poverty tries to give them. This is as noble an effort as the war on smallpox

or the war on yellow fever. All of this marked the onward march of society.

The war on poverty is in that noble tradition. We should be proud that at long last history has permitted us to undertake to lend a hand, because there were days when not much could be done and persons had to suffer under the weight of a curse of the ages because it was written in the heavens that there had to be poverty and there had to be poor.

Mr. President, that is the real philosophical question. If we could once free our minds in that respect, and recognize that this is a war which fully rates with any other war on the physical scourges of mankind, like disease, then we would be halfway home rather than being bogged down in doubts of doing anything about it at all.

(At this point, Mr. GORE assumed the chair.)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New York for his attention to one program particularly which he is introducing. I refer to the \$25 million for small business counseling, management, and training focused on the ghetto areas.

It has always seemed to me that one of the great problems we have had in this country with migration is that we had migration from Europe where Italians came here and established themselves in business—and they developed the biggest bank in the world, the Bank of America—Scandinavians came to this country and they developed all kinds of businesses in contracting, construction, and architectural firms; the Chinese came to this country and established small businesses, retail stores, laundries, restaurants, and so forth; and yet, we have had a migration of people, accelerated in the last decade, from the South to the North. The great difficulty is that these people, the Negro population, many times do not feel they are a part of the community in which they reside. There is no way in which they could translate themselves into ownership in this country. They do not own housing. Essentially they rent either from a slum landlord or from public housing. For the most part they are sold to by outside people, even in retail establishments in the community.

After the war we spent billions of dollars providing technical assistance to our enemy to rebuild and billions of dollars to our allies to rebuild, and since then to developing nations to develop business so that they could establish an economic foundation.

Yet we have not provided the kind of technical and managerial assistance to our own people—22 million people at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Mr. President, a year and a half ago, a group of us in the city of Chicago got together under the name of the New Illinois Committee, which I have been honored to chair, to see whether we could not get businessmen in Chicago to provide technical assistance to its own city residents. A group of 40 to 50 aggressive,

young, able executives, sales managers, industrial engineers, accountants, and lawyers are ready to go to work to assist any small business in the minority element in the ghetto areas of the city to keep their businesses going, which are now struggling to survive, or in providing counsel and advice to help a business get underway.

I think that this constructive approach being taken by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is in an area of urgent need. It will solve or help to solve many of the problems we see ahead. It is certainly the right kind of thing to do in the right way, to make taxpayers out of citizens who feel a sense of exploitation, and to make them entrepreneurs and owners of businesses in this country, just as many of us are working to have them become owners of their own housing.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know of a Member of the Senate whose approval upon this particular question would be more apposite, not only gratifying to me as a Senator and friend, but also apposite to the issue. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] is in his own right a very distinguished and highly successful business leader. He understands a thing or two about business success, its consequences to the person who succeeds, and its importance to the community.

As he only intimated, he is himself the author of a very distinguished plan, in which so many of us have joined him, to encourage homeownership. The direct complement of homeownership is business ownership. This is not beyond the ken of the poor, any more than learning a skill, getting a job, or raising a family.

Therefore, I welcome very much the comradeship and the assistance of the Senator from Illinois in this matter. It is a very strong confirmation of the soundness of the lines we want to pursue.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent statement of the Senator from New York on the purposes and need of the poverty program. I have always supported this program.

I have, though, been very desirous that the most effective program would be developed in the committees of the Congress, and I have taken comfort from the fact that the Senator from New York is a member of the committee which develops and presents this program to the Senate.

However, I have been discouraged, because after 3 years, it seems to me that the program is not as effective as it could be.

I believe that the program, to be successful, must have the full cooperation and support of the States and local governments, in terms of resources, participation, and in terms of the involvement of the people of the community and in the State.

I note that in the case of committees established to initiate and administer community action programs—it was recommended by the administration that State and local officials, or the appropriate officials of the community must be

included in the membership of the governing local committee. But the Senate committee did not accept the recommendations of the administration to mandatorily include such officials.

It seems to me that from the standpoint of securing the resources and the cooperation of the government of the area, it would be important and necessary to include the appropriate officials of the community on such a committee; also, to assure the local responsibility needed it seems to me that local officials ought to be included. I ask the Senator, why did the Senate committee take the position that the inclusion of local officials be not required?

Mr. JAVITS. The danger, Mr. President, is in domination. It was felt that if we were to encourage participation by the poor themselves in the Community Action boards and agencies that these were people who might be dominated—overwhelmed as it were—by the presence of important civic figures.

One cannot in any case keep a major from exerting an important, perhaps preponderant influence on these matters—no one really expects that we can. We only add to the possibility of undercutting real participation by the poor themselves if we insist that important public officials actually sit on such a board.

I do not feel that strongly about it myself. I feel that such officials could be part of a board, provided they do not dominate the board. I would be willing to run that risk, in order to give maximum flexibility and support in organizing those boards and agencies.

I think that we will find in the amendment process, in the course of the next few days, that that will be taken care of.

Mr. COOPER. I recognize the problem that the Senator has stated. I am sure that one of the considerations the committee has taken to mind is the possibility that in certain areas of the county—and I say this without any derogation—in the South and elsewhere, because of the problems of integration, it might not be possible to secure an effective organization.

The Senator has stated another problem, that the poor might believe they were being dominated by a local official. That is counseling fear too much, when we consider the necessity of reaching the leadership and resources of local governments.

If this poverty program is to succeed, if we want it to succeed—and the Senator is doing everything he can to make it succeed, as I want it to succeed—I believe it would be a mistake not to include these officials.

The OEO Director has procedural power to guarantee, as I see it, the initiation of programs and even though there is local opposition.

I do not see any danger from that score. I have witnessed in life and in experience the advancement of the great majority of the people of the country in income, in opportunities for educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities for which we are thankful. But all around live other groups of people who have gone backwards, relatively and absolutely. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. JAVITS. I do. I think that the gap widens rather than narrows.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. We are in danger, in some places in this country, of having a class system, which would be contrary to the promises held out by our country to all our citizens. I believe this program is necessary, but I must say I cannot see how the problems will ever be met and how these people will be given the opportunity to lift themselves up unless the full resources of our country—Federal, State, local, and private—are united.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. COOPER. This is the chief reason I argue that the participation of local government officials is required.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 5 minutes, to conclude my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], may I direct his attention and that of other Senators to page 49 of the report, which contemplates inclusion on such boards of the chief elected official or his representative; but it is not elevated to the status of legislation.

I personally would not have any major objections to the inclusion in the bill itself of provision for such officials, though we did contemplate it in the report.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has an amendment—No. 345—which does precisely what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has in mind.

Mr. JAVITS. That was one of the amendments that went over.

Mr. President, to conclude my statement, perhaps the most critical question facing the Congress this year concerning the war on poverty is the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Our subcommittee heard testimony in over a dozen cities. We received reports from seven independent consulting firms analyzing community action programs throughout the country. We have had dozens of reports from our own special study staff.

In my judgment, a review of this record results in only one conclusion that can be drawn—that it is crucial to the war on poverty and to the climate of opinion in the slums that the Office of Economic Opportunity be preserved.

I said before that it could be slowly phased out—I believe it should be—but I do not think we should dismember it. I think we ought to phase it out gradually, particular activity by particular activity. Some of OEO programs have already gone to other Government departments, and more will. But the point is that the war on poverty attempts to construct an all-points attack, recognizing that the problem, in addition to lack of education, job training, or decent housing, is the problem of personal dignity and the whole spectrum of needs.

All this dictates the continuance of the agency.

Moreover, I would doubt that we would have many of the antipoverty programs we now have if we had had to rely upon innovations from established agencies. Would the Office of Education in HEW have produced Headstart? Would the Justice Department have evolved the legal - services - for - the - poor concept? Would the Department of HUD have evolved the community action program? OEO has been and continues to be innovative. To deprive it of the bulk of its operating programs would drastically reduce its ability to induce institutional change in other Federal departments and in local agencies.

In addition, the existence of an OEO with substantial operating funds provides the communities with a kind of local initiative which is not possible under other programs. Community action is basically a block grant, a concept so dear to my colleagues on the Republican side, and one which I believe to be proper as the next step in a proper reshaping of our federal system.

Under community action, a locality is given a pot of money with which it can do almost as it wishes, within certain very broad program limits and procedural requirements such as participation of the poor. If it feels that it particularly needs funds for remedial education, it can spend its money for that purpose; if it wants job training, that is possible. In this manner, communities can fill the shortcomings and interstices left by other Federal programs and can that way tailor the whole package more closely to local conditions.

Finally, OEO is important for another equally important set of reasons—its psychological importance. It is perfectly clear to me, and I know it to be the case in New York City, that the agency is more than a set of programs—it is a symbol of Government concern for the poor. To the slum dweller and the resident of a depressed rural area, the existence of the OEO means that the Federal Government recognizes the problem of poverty—its budget is, to him, the measure of governmental concern. More than that, the OEO programs at the local level are community programs—they are not handed down from above but are locally selected and, at least to some extent, are governed by community people. That approach is unique among Federal programs. That poor people think this to be a program for them and by them—this to me accounts for the positive record of OEO during this summer's riots. Of over 30,000 community action employees, only 16 were arrested, and of these only 6 were full-time workers. None have been convicted. And of 244 buildings which the poverty program has in the heart of the riot areas, none were burned or destroyed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for all those reasons, and with special reference

to permitting the encouragement of private enterprise activity in this field, I think in essence the bill is right, though I do not foreclose myself from supporting an amendment or two. In essence, the bill is right. The war on poverty is an OEO activity and it should continue head it. I am against dismembering OEO. If we did, we would definitely end the hope for winning the war on poverty, and this would be a disastrous blow to the aspirations, destiny, and hopes of our Nation.

I yield the floor, and I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for indulging me a few extra minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 343.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending. Does the Senator wish to have it read again at this time?

Mr. MONTTOYA. No. I should like to give a little more explanation of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MONTTOYA. The amendment is designed to cure what I consider is a grave deficiency in the Economic Opportunity Act. The original Economic Opportunity Act, while it was designed to help poor people throughout the country to organize community effort, which was sanctioned by its provisions, had no requirement that the governing board of such community effort should have representation by the poor people.

A subsequent amendment, of 1966, incorporated such a provision so as to insure that in a community one-third of the membership of a governing board should be representative of those people. This provision has now been in effect for a year, and there is continuing concern as to whether such a group in a community is clearly and effectively represented on community action boards.

My amendment is designed to insure that the entire spectrum of a community be represented on the boards. I have tried through the amendment to cure this deficiency.

This particular amendment, No. 343, prescribes that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall prescribe and promulgate nationally such regulations as will insure a democratic process and procedure in the deliberations of the boards. It has been my observation of many community action groups that a quorum, which is required under the articles of incorporation or under other systems of operation, usually assembles and convenes the meetings.

Then, after prolonged deliberation or consideration, members of the board will walk out, and, with the record and the minutes of the hearing showing a quo-

rum present, the remaining members—who might be a minority of the board at that stage of the proceedings—conduct business and pass on important policy matters; and thereafter, the community complains that the action taken is inimical to the objectives as outlined in other meetings previously held, and great dissension occurs.

Under my amendment, the obligation devolves upon the OEO director to promulgate uniform rules and regulations so as to insure majority participation at important stages of deliberation by the community action boards throughout the country. At present we have a lack of uniformity in this respect, because there are no rules issued from Washington to govern the action of the local community boards. The conduct of the proceedings, up to now, has been dependent upon local whims, local innovations, or locally prescribed methods of procedure.

So, with the lack of national uniformity, we may have uniformity proliferating within a State or within a municipality, which may come to govern the proceedings of its community action boards. Thus the Washington office, in evaluating whether the democratic process actually was observed, is hampered, because the office here in Washington, in trying to evaluate whether or not there was propriety in the proceedings, has to go back to the local board and analyze its customs and the procedures to which it has adhered in other deliberations.

My amendment would seek to bring about the kind of uniformity that would tell these local action boards "You will adhere to these rules of procedure, print them and provide them to all those who are interested in your deliberations, especially to members of your governing board and to the neighborhood associations, so that they, in turn, will inform the people as to what can be done under what circumstances, what procedure has to be adhered to, and what notices of public meetings must be posted, and in what manner." All these things will have to be prescribed by the OEO Director.

I cite an example of what I believe is a very flagrant violation of the purposes Congress had in mind when we enacted the antipoverty legislation: In one community in New Mexico, when it was sought to organize a community action committee, the original notices which went out provided for an election to be held at 2 o'clock on a weekday afternoon. This is a mining community. On a weekday at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, none of the workers in the region were able to be present or represented in the election process. Nevertheless, the election was held; and so many of their leaders were not represented on the board because they could not attend the election.

I took the matter up with the OEO Director, and asked him if he could have another election in that community, which could be held in the evening, so that the people themselves would have a voice in the selection of the board.

I have not received an answer yet as to what the OEO Director can do. However, I do know that there is no Federal

regulation or provision in the Federal law to prevent this kind of thing happening.

I know of another instance in my State where they had an annual election as prescribed by the articles of organization of the community action group, and the people ousted the in-group and elected a new group.

The old group which had been ousted refused to turn over the records. Then the State Office of Economic Opportunity, under the Governor's office, sent a letter to the new group asking them to hold a new election and saying that the election which had been held was not properly held.

The new group consulted me on this matter, and this was my advice to the duly elected new group: That the State Office of Economic Opportunity had no right to interfere and to say whether an election held was duly held, that that was a matter for the OEO in Washington to determine whether the election had been properly held, and that in the absence of such a finding by Washington or by the regional office of the OEO, they should consider themselves duly elected if they had adhered to all of the procedures in their articles of incorporation.

Mr. President, these things are happening all over the country. And I think it is about time that we develop a kind of uniformity of procedure by which everyone will be conscious of the steps that have to be taken to insure the carrying out of the democratic process which is encompassed in the spirit and the law of the Economic Opportunity Act as originally passed and as it has been amended and as we will amend it this week through the enactment of the pending bill.

I fully appreciate the great effort that has been put forth by the committee in trying to bring before the Senate a very good bill.

Our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has performed an enormous job in going all over the country, as have members of his subcommittee, and trying to find out what people need, want, and require so that we might put a better sense of direction into the economic opportunity program.

The members of the committee deserve the commendation of not only Congress, but also the country. The volumes of hearings on the desks of every Senator testify to the great task which has been performed by the committee members.

My purpose in offering amendments today is to try to perfect a *modus operandi* to try to take care of those very things which militate against the efficient operation of this vital program.

The pending amendment, amendment No. 343, imposes upon the National Director the duty of promulgating such standards and rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums, procedures, establishment of committees and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure the democratic process.

The pending amendment is vitally needed to delineate, to specify, and to bring about a more definitive approach to take care of this problem about which I have spoken here today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have given a good deal of thought to the pending amendment. I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from New Mexico and with his staff.

To me, the amendment is entirely appropriate and I would be glad to accept it. I do not know how my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], feels about it. However, for myself I see nothing wrong with the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], will wish to be heard, albeit briefly, in a very few minutes.

Speaking for myself, I do think, as someone said here yesterday, and not facetiously, that these are better rules than the Senate operates by.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has always made a valiant fight to change the rules of the Senate.

I believe that the rules encompassed in amendment No. 343 with relation to the conduct of the community action program would constitute a very desirable change. I shall support it.

I do have a certain reservation with respect to amendment No. 345 which is in the group of amendments presented here. I have no objection, however, to amendment No. 343.

In order to preserve the right of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to address himself to all of these amendments, I should like to have the Senator from New Mexico bear with me momentarily so that we might discuss amendment No. 345, as that is an amendment he will offer shortly, an amendment which the Senator from Pennsylvania will undoubtedly address himself to in the same manner. As far as the Senator from Pennsylvania is concerned, that amendment will also be satisfactory.

What disquiets me about amendment No. 345 is not the substance of it. I think the substance is entirely sound—that is, that there should be an opportunity for representation upon these boards and agencies of the chief elected official and other appropriate elected officials. In that, I should say I agree with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who spoke earlier today.

What does bother me is the stratifying of it in the context of a one-third requirement. What troubles me about that, frankly, is that there are persons in communities in this country—and we all recognize the fact—who, if a mandatory requirement is made for one-third of the public officials, will take all the places themselves and will comprise such a powerhouse in terms of the establishment that they really will dominate any such committee or agency?

It seems to me that such a proposal as is now presented would play directly into the hands of interests which might be hostile to conducting the war on poverty, and which could immobilize it in many ways, especially by the impact of their own authority and their own personalities in terms of having so large a number of places absolutely guaranteed to them.

I might point out that this approach

was originally used by the administration though without the one-third requirement. However, the committee did not go along with it, although the administration had proposed it. The administration proposal is contained in an amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], amendment No. 349, which, it seems to me, quite adequately guarantees representation of exactly the kind which amendment No. 345 calls for, but does not stratify it in such a way as to endanger the integrity, in my judgment, of particular local boards.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONTROYA. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has requested that I join his name as a cosponsor of this particular amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 345.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator this question: So long as he and Senator MONRONEY are joining, which I think is splendid, what would the Senator think of going one step further and adopting the language of his amendment to the language of the Monroney amendment, thereby relieving people such as myself of the element of concern that there are areas in the country—unfortunately, not a few areas but more than a few—where, if you build in this one-third requirement, you will be running afoul of the danger of a board which really would be overwhelmed or really would be dominated? Would the Senator consider conforming his amendment, so long as he has joined with Senator MONRONEY, to the original administration language? It is not my language; it is the administration language.

Mr. MONTROYA. What is the original administration language?

Mr. JAVITS. The original language is essentially contained in amendment No. 349 of Senator MONRONEY:

SEC. 213. (a) A community action agency shall be established in order to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program as developed and implemented is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board organized to provide for membership of the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials, or their representatives, of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

In short, it just does not lock in the one-third requirement, but it does everything that the Senator from New Mexico desires be done.

Mr. MONTROYA. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MONTROYA. Would this language reassure the Senator from New York,

with respect to provision (d) on page 2 of my amendment:

The remainder of the board shall consist of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, and other major groups and interests in the community.

Mr. JAVITS. I have pointed out that that is exactly what Senator Monroney's amendment provides for, but it leaves out the mandatory requirement for one-third of the places. It leaves it flexible and open to the local situation, and there may be cases in a locality where one-third would be fine, perhaps even more. But there are localities in the country where, if you write in a one-third requirement, you will guarantee a dominated board or agency because of a local situation. That is why I suggested to the Senator from New Mexico the elimination of the mandatory one-third—just leaving it open.

Mr. MONTROYA. Would the Senator agree to a compromise of this nature: Instead of saying "which does not have at least one-third," using the words "which does not have close to one-third"?

Mr. JAVITS. I would not, because I believe the Senator is defeating his own purpose. If the Senator just said that they are to afford an opportunity for membership or representation, that is if the Senator just said "which is conducted, administered or coordinated by a board which affords an opportunity for membership," and so forth, I could support it.

Just leave out the freezing in of an absolute one-third requirement, and that would leave the program free and in the position of being able to adapt to local situations where one-third could result in a dominated board. That is the only point I press.

Mr. MONTROYA. Would this language be acceptable to the Senator from New York:

The director shall not approve, or continue to fund after June 1, 1968, a community action program, which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which affords an opportunity for membership or representation to the chief elected officials.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator would have to use the words "which does not afford."

Mr. MONTROYA. "Which does not afford."

Mr. JAVITS. That is the way the grammar is constructed.

Mr. MONTROYA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That wording would be acceptable to me, and I would thank the Senator if he would conform it accordingly. The amendment is not up for consideration as yet.

Mr. MONTROYA. Yes, I will certainly offer that as a modification.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I understand it, the effect of the amendment proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico would be to make it mandatory for the Director of OEO to promulgate rules for local community action agencies relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, forms, procedures, establishment of committees, and so forth.

I regretfully find it necessary to oppose the adoption of this amendment, because, as I have suggested, it would write into the law specific mandates for the Director of OEO to regulate every community action agency throughout the Government from Washington.

As I pointed out in my remarks on the floor of the Senate on Monday, I believe that the concept of community neighborhood corporations and local community action agencies can do much for relieving the isolation and alienation expressed by the disadvantaged living in our large cities.

However, once the Director of OEO is put in a position of having to establish elaborate regulations governing every procedure by a local community action agency, we deprive that local agency of necessary autonomy to work out its own problems.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate recognizes that an organization can grow in self-confidence and responsibility, and finally can assume additional authority by having some freedom in working out procedures and regulations which are most applicable to its local area. If we become obsessed with dotting every "I" and establishing every format and every procedure which guides the local agency, we will be taking away its power to grow in strength and to accommodate itself to local conditions.

I found it most interesting to read accounts of Daniel Moynihan's speech before the Americans for Democratic Action. In that speech he pointed out:

Liberals should divest themselves of the notion that the Nation can be run from agencies in Washington and should work toward a decentralization of government powers.

While the proposed amendment, on its face, would do little more than put into the legislation a practice already being followed by OEO, it could be argued that there is no justifiable reason for opposing it. However, we have reached the point where we either have faith in the community action concept or we do not. I, for one, believe that the local community action agencies need some autonomy, and we at the Federal level should not write into the law language which is contrary to the principle of decentralization and local autonomy.

Mr. President, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays. I yield the floor.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I disagree with the interpretation of this amendment by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Vermont. This is not a centralization amendment. This is an amendment which would insure for the people at the community level the type of democratic process that was envisioned by Congress in enacting the original law.

This is in furtherance of the democratic concept that people should have a majority voice in the deliberations of the community action committees which are organized pursuant to the authorization of this law. I see nothing akin to what the Senator from Vermont has related, and which draws an interpretation of centralization of power here in Washington. It merely provides for promulgation of definite and uniform rules of procedure so as to assure to the majority that their

voice will carry in deliberations and insure to the minority that they will be heard at the local level in the deliberations that might transpire within the purview of the act.

Mr. President, that is all the amendment does. I am sorry I do not have the support of my good friend from Vermont. I had no intention of bringing about the result he has given in his interpretation of this bill. Therefore, I do not think I have anything further to say other than to reiterate that I am motivated by a desire to insure more democracy to people at the local level in exercising or using their voice within the purview of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment if no one else does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Is there a division?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. All those in favor say "aye."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, a point of order. The vote was already in progress. The Chair had already called for the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum. The vote has not been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, would a point of order be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to request a division.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I request a division. Before that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MONTROYA. Will the Senator withhold the request for a quorum temporarily? Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, can a division be requested after the vote is started?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The result had not been announced.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, can a division be requested after the vote is started, but before the result is announced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It must be requested before the result is announced.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for a division vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the pending amendment. A division has been requested. [Putting the question.]

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 344

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 344.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 46, in line 11, strike out the words "public and" and insert in lieu thereof "Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all available".

Beginning on page 46, at line 23, strike out everything after the period in that line through the period in line 1 on page 47, and insert in lieu thereof "In order to merit financial assistance under this title, a community action agency shall be responsible for and must be capable of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating a community action program, and, to the extent permitted by relevant law, be capable of mobilizing all Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all available private resources."

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, on yesterday I explained what this amendment is designed to do. I do not desire to take too much time today except to say by way of preface that the present Economic Opportunity Act does not concisely and precisely state what the duties of the community action committees or boards might be.

There is a misconception, in many parts of the country, on the part of those who are on these committees, that their duties are confined to those operations which come strictly and only within the purview of the OEO Act, such as projects like Headstart, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Legal Aid, and other related activities which are provided for in the OEO Act.

But there is a stated purpose which was delineated in the committee report by Congress when it enacted the legislation that the community action group or agencies should serve as catalysts for community action and community approach with respect to poverty and economic development.

My amendment tends to create more definitively these duties for the community action groups. It says specifically that they are to marshal the resources of a community from the local governmental unit, the Federal agencies and the private sources, and to blueprint a plan of action. They are to serve as catalysts in such a movement. That is what Congress had in mind. But they have more or less refused to shoulder this responsibility in many areas of the country.

That is why we have such criticism of the OEO programs because they have not expanded their sphere of activities to try to bring about a more comprehensive approach to the economic problems which these communities face.

My amendment puts a responsibility on the CAP agency to plan, to conduct, to administer, and to evaluate the community action program and, to the extent permitted by relevant law, to provide the capability to mobilize all Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all available private resources.

This is not designed to impose a superstructure known as community action agency upon all the other departments of the Federal or local governments. This is merely something that will sanction and direct the community action agency to go to all these public agencies and try to tell them, "This is what we can do. This is where you can help. Together, acting in concert, we can help this community through the different Federal programs under the different Federal agencies."

They cannot superimpose their will upon these Federal agencies. This directs them to consult with them so that some kind of formidable plan and formidable approach can evolve through the collective efforts on the part of Federal agencies and the CAP agency.

Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. I do not think there is any controversy to it. I think it will do worlds of good. It will stimulate action among the community action agencies throughout the country, once they know what Congress expects them to do.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I see nothing objectionable about this amendment. For myself, I would be happy to accept it.

All it does is to put into legislative language what is being done, anyway, administratively by OEO. The amendment has some merit in making it specific and putting it in the bill.

However, I do not know what my friends on the other side of the aisle think. Accordingly, I yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am opposed to this amendment. First of all, as the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has just pointed out, OEO is now doing administratively exactly what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico seeks to achieve with this additional language. If that is the case, it seems to me that adoption of this amendment would be superfluous.

If that were the only fault, Mr. President, I would not object to its adoption. However, I believe that specifying coordination of Federal, State and local activities in the law raises several serious objections.

First, Sargent Shriver has pointed out that community action agencies perform the best services in those areas where they receive cooperation from local government. Now, if we specifically point out in the law that a community action agency is in effect short-circuiting State and local governments, I believe that many local governments will resent

this intrusion and will be less cooperative in our all-out efforts to combat poverty.

Second, Mr. President, I believe that we have seen that there are at least several States which are doing a better job of coordination than any community action agency could ever hope to attain. I am thinking specifically, Mr. President, of the State of New Jersey, where Paul Yluisaker, formerly with the Ford Foundation, became statewide director of community affairs. In the State of New Jersey, I believe we are seeing an excellent use of State government to achieve coordination. If we become too specific in granting the local community action agency this broad authority for coordination, we may well undermine the coordination efforts by many of our States and local communities.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that this amendment, which everyone seems to admit is not really necessary, be rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am interested in what the Senator from Vermont just said. However, we have conferred with Mr. Shriver's office; and the OEO people, it is my understanding, have no objection to the amendment. In fact, they helped to draft it. Thus, I think we can legitimately say that this amendment is not opposed by the OEO. That is one reason why I was prepared to take it, let me say to my good friend from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. The mere fact that OEO does not oppose the amendment does not necessarily make it a good amendment, in my view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 345

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 345 and ask that it be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 48, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after June 1, 1968, a community action program, which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which does not have at least one-third of the authorized places thereon designated so as to afford an opportunity for membership or representation to the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials or their representatives. Failure of those officials to avail themselves of all or part of the places so designated shall not, however, preclude establishment of an alternate board structure which is broadly representative of the community and otherwise consistent with the requirements of this section. The Director may require, with respect to the places designated for occupancy by public officials, that appropriate representation be provided for State or regional agencies, in situations in which a community action agency serves two or more counties."

On page 48, at the beginning of line 15, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 48, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following:

"(d) The remainder of the board shall consist of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate

representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community."

On page 48, in line 25, strike out the subsection designation "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I submit a modified amendment, in lieu of the pending amendment, which is in line with the colloquy the Senator from New York and I had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 48, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after June 1, 1968, a community action program, which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which does not afford an opportunity for membership or representation to the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials or their representatives. Failure of those officials to avail themselves of all or part of the places so designated shall not, however, preclude establishment of an alternate board structure which is broadly representative of the community and otherwise consistent with the requirements of this section. The Director may require, with respect to the places designated for occupancy by public officials, that appropriate representation be provided for State or regional agencies, in situations in which a community action agency serves two or more counties.

"(d) The remainder of the board shall consist of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico desire that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. MONTTOYA. Yes, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, as I stated before in my colloquy with the Senator from New York and as I stated yesterday, originally the Economic Opportunity Act did not have a specific provision providing for one-third participation on the part of the poor in the composition of community action boards.

Then, in 1966, by virtue of an amendment, the Congress put in a provision insuring this participation, although the instructions from OEO throughout the country initially had been to give the poor representation on these boards. This was followed generally throughout the country. Then the mandate of the Congress last year insured this participation.

There was no provision in the law, there was no history in the legislation, and there was no encouragement, perhaps, from OEO that the local officials or the local business communities should participate, although they did participate, in the composition of the boards in most instances.

I feel that it is vitally necessary for the local officials, be they county or municipal officials, to participate in the planning and deliberations of community action agencies, because, in many instances, coordinating with the local

governmental set-up is most essential to insure the success of the local programs.

While this has been a matter of practice, it is not in the law as a matter of mandate; and my amendment is designed to accomplish this purpose.

In addition, the second part of my amendment carries another provision which encourages within the composition of these boards the participation of business, labor, religious groups, and other major groups and interests in the community. This is the first time that this section will appear in the Economic Opportunity Act. It will insure a general-spectrum representation in the community action agency.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONTTOYA. Yes; I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Reading the Senator's amendment, it states, on line 8, at page 1, "Chief elected official or officials of the community." Would the Senator spell out for me what he means by "officials of the community?"

Mr. MONTTOYA. Perhaps the mayor.

Mr. MURPHY. Who would be the "chief?"

Mr. MONTTOYA. Perhaps the members of the city council.

Mr. MURPHY. I see.

Mr. MONTTOYA. County officials.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that there are a number of rural community action agencies which serve a number of counties and many of these communities have three or more supervisors or officials as the chief elected officials. Sometimes there are two from one party and one from the other. To have each of them on a local board might result in an over-large governing board. I would assume the Senator from New Mexico would accept a reasonable interpretation so that if perhaps there were officials from several local governments, representation could be amicably worked out so that, for example, one from a community could be the representative if there were three. The question is, How big is the community? Where the community is co-terminous with the city, it is simple. Where it goes out and takes in surrounding counties, it is more difficult administratively.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I may say to the Senator from California, and in answer to the query of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that originally, in the amendment which I first proposed, I had a requirement that one-third of the board be comprised of elected officials. I gave serious thought to the very question the Senator from California has raised, and concluded that such representation might not become possible where there were more than two counties, where there was a group of communities, and so forth. So that was the purpose of my modification. So the provision for a minimum one-third was taken out of the amendment and there was merely a statement of the purpose that some of the elected officials should be given participation in these boards.

Mr. MURPHY. That was the purpose

of my question. I thank the Senator for explaining it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTTOYA. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I think the modified language represents language which is much superior and preferable to that which is in the bill, and I am happy to support it.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONTTOYA. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have just entered the Chamber; is it correct that the Senator's amendment would provide that the appropriate local officials must be members of local governing agencies or boards?

Mr. MONTTOYA. It is not a mandatory requirement; it is merely an encouragement that there be participation in the membership of the board on the part of local or county officials, or if there are more than one county, there is provision for regional membership within that stated group.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me briefly, I think I can satisfy the Senator from Kentucky, who said he just came into the Chamber. If he will look at lines 7, 8, and 9 of the first page of the Senator's amendment, he will see that an opportunity for membership or representation to the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials or their representatives is to be given. Then if they do not want to go on, they do not have to.

Mr. COOPER. An opportunity. I noted that the bill sent up by the administration provided that appropriate local officials should be members of the governing board supervising the community action programs. Is that correct?

Mr. MONTTOYA. I had that provision in my original amendment. Now it is permissive.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. The committee gave that matter a great deal of consideration. We found in our inquiries that a good many local officials do not want to go on the boards and prefer to have the community action boards function without their participation. Accordingly, we thought that to force them to go on the boards when they did not want to was unwise, and we changed the administration's position.

Mr. COOPER. The original language provided that the chief official or a representative of the local government should be a member. Did it not require that the chief local officials should be members?

Mr. CLARK. It was a mandatory provision of the administration bill. I asked my friend from Vermont whether or not he agreed with that provision, and I think he felt that it was better to leave it permissible, and not make it mandatory.

Mr. COOPER. I propose to offer an amendment which would make it mandatory, but I shall not stand in the way of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Mexico, because I think it is an improvement.

At the proper time, I shall offer an amendment, and call it up, to make it mandatory that the chief official, or at

least delegated officials of the local government, shall be members of these boards. I shall not take the time of the Senate now to give my reasons, but I intend to do so at an appropriate time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no objection to the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico. It is my understanding that the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from California, both members of the committee, are in accord, so I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is contemplated that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] will now call up his amendment, which would transfer the Headstart program to the Office of Education. I would anticipate that he and I, with the cooperation of the leadership, could agree on a limit of time for debate on that amendment. However, I see that the Senator is not in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to work out a unanimous-consent agreement with the Senator. However, the acting majority leader, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] suggests that the Senator from Colorado talk on his amendment for a while first.

Mr. DOMINICK. That will be satisfactory.

AMENDMENT NO. 342

Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 74, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following new paragraph:

"(7) Beginning after June 30, 1968, no financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide comprehensive educational programs and services for young children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance or such programs and services designed to benefit children in kindergarten or elementary school."

On page 126, after line 11, add the following new title:

"TITLE III—AMENDMENT TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 RELATING TO PRESCHOOL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

"PRESCHOOL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 301. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating title VII as title VIII, by redesignating sections 701 through 706 and references thereto as section 801 through 806, respectively, and by adding after title VI the following new title:

"TITLE VII—PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

"ALLOTMENT TO STATES

"SEC. 701. From the sums appropriated to make basic grants under this title for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also reserve not more than 10 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. That part of any State allotment which the Commissioner determines will not be needed may be reallocated, on such dates during the fiscal year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States, in proportion to their original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States.

"STATE PLANS

"SEC. 702. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

"(1) provides that the State educational agency will be the sole State agency for the administration of the State plan;

"(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 701 will be used solely to make grants to community action boards (established pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964), or in any community where there is no qualified community action board, to local educational agencies to assist them in carrying on preschool programs which, under subsection (b), are eligible for assistance under this title;

"(3) provides that effective procedures will be adopted for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices developed through such projects;

"(4) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any funds paid by the State to any other agency) under this title;

"(5) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may find neces-

sary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(6) provides a balanced program to meet the educational, nutritional, health, clothing, and other unique needs of children from impoverished backgrounds in order for them to function at optimum levels in relationship to other children; and

"(7) provides a standard of poverty for individuals and families in the State that takes into account the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of individuals and families to be self-sustaining.

"(b) A preschool program shall be eligible for assistance under this title if (1) it is designed to prepare educationally deprived children, aged three through seven, in areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families to successfully undertake the regular elementary school program, (2) it is carried on by, or under contracts or arrangements with, a community action board, or, if carried on in an area in which there is no community action board, is carried on by a local educational agency, and (3) it is limited to participation by children from families meeting the poverty standards established under section 702(a)(7).

"(c) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which meets the requirements of subsection (a).

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 703. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 701, the Commissioner shall pay to each State an amount equal to the Federal share of the expenditures made by such State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments and underpayments.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a), the Federal share for each State shall be 90 per centum for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970.

"ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 704. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such agency, finds—

"(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 702(a), or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"(c) In the event a State shall, within a reasonable time, fail to submit a State plan, or shall fail to submit an acceptable State plan under circumstances that the Commissioner believes indicate a desire on the part of State officials to prevent operation of any acceptable program under this title within the State, the Commissioner is authorized to contract directly with qualified community action boards, or in any community where there is no qualified community action boards, directly with educational agencies to implement programs under this title within such State.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 705. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 702(a) or with his final action under section 704(b), such State may

within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 706. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year. There is authorized to be appropriated \$375,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and \$400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, to make grants to States for pre-school programs under this title."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this is a fairly long amendment which is why I asked that the clerk not read it. I do not intend to take up very much time. I understand that the distinguished floor manager of the bill does not intend to take up too much time on the pending amendment.

I think the pending amendment is very important. Yesterday, when I was discussing the amendment with a few people, I was told that this is perhaps as important an amendment as we will face, on this bill because it is a matter of principle as to which direction, the Office of Economic Opportunity, is going to go.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree completely with what the Senator from Colorado says. However, I suggest that this is a very important amendment and that we allow 1 hour on each side. That will bring a vote on at about 4 o'clock. I should think that the Senator would agree that if any amendments are to be presented to the amendment, these should be germane, and that an amendment to the amendment perhaps should receive 10 minutes to each side.

Mr. DOMINICK. I hope that we can get through even sooner than that. I do not know of any amendments to the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Neither do I. However, with 100 prima donnas, one never knows what will happen in that regard.

My view would be that we could yield back at the end of the debate the time that had not been consumed. However, I should like to have an hour in the event that I might need it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I would make one request in connection with that, and that is that we could have a live quorum approximately 20 minutes before the vote so that each of us could have 10 minutes to explain the amendment to the Senators when they arrive here.

It does get a little exasperating to talk on a subject when not very many Senators are present in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it appears that it is impossible to arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement. I suggest that the Senator from Colorado proceed with the debate on his amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 342

Mr. DOMINICK. It is my guess that we might get through with the debate on the pending amendment sooner if we could go along in the normal course of events than if we thought we had to consume a certain amount of time. So I will proceed with the debate on the pending amendment.

The purpose of the amendment is to take the Headstart program, which is presently being operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and transfer it, not this year, but in the next fiscal year, to the Office of Education.

I use the phraseology "the next fiscal year" on purpose.

As of a couple of years ago, many of our colleagues said that all the education programs should be transferred into the Office of Education, regardless of what agency was running the program. As a part of that policy, in 1966 we transferred the work study program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education, along with the adult education.

I offered an amendment at that time to accomplish the same thing with Headstart. Almost all of the witnesses that came before the Education Subcommittee agreed that this was a good thought, but they also said that from the administration point of view, they were not sure the time was right and that we ought to wait a year.

Later is now, and a year later from then is now. Therefore, on the basis of the testimony in 1966, we could probably legitimately make a case for transferring Headstart immediately. However, I have had some people talk to me about this problem, both fellow Senators and people from the Office of Education. They felt that in some areas of the country, at least, perhaps the school systems were not equipped to be able to carry out this provision immediately and that therefore an immediate transfer would not be as orderly as we would like.

As a result, I took that into consideration and modified my original amendment and prepared the pending amend-

ment, No. 342, which provides that this transfer will become effective in the fiscal year 1969, and not in the fiscal year 1968.

That would give us time to coordinate a program. It would give us time to determine how we will continue.

Perhaps some details in connection with this would be helpful, at least for the record. Under the present setup of the poverty program that is presently being considered, Headstart is lumped, along with other community action programs, into an overall authorization in title II.

This was true in fiscal year 1966. In fiscal year 1967, the committee specifically earmarked Headstart so that it could not be cut out by the community action planners and so that it could not be cut out in favor of other programs because it was the feeling of the committee that this is an excellent program, a program that deserves support.

This year the earmarking of funds was eliminated and Headstart was once again lumped in with the other community action programs to compete for funds at the will of the bureaucrats.

I have no concern that Headstart will be thoroughly abandoned, I want to say, but I do think we ought to be able to know what amount of money will be used for it, so that those involved can make plans based on the funds authorized.

We do not have any such provision in the pending bill. My amendment, to the contrary, would provide that if we transferred Headstart over to the Office of Education, we would have in the first fiscal year that this would be authorized—namely, in fiscal year 1969—\$375 million available for Headstart.

We have authorized a 2-year program. For the fiscal year 1970, we have requested an authorization of \$400 million.

I think these are reasonable projections. They are authorizations only. They are not appropriations. However, they do give some idea of the scope and extent to which I, at least, believe that the Headstart program should go.

It is interesting to note in this connection that although title I of the present bill provides for authorizations for the respective titles in it for fiscal year 1968, and although this also covers fiscal year 1969, the 1969 authorization is completely open-ended in the present bill. This is so despite my objection, because over and over again I have taken the position, before every committee on which I have served, that if we are to have authorizations, we must have an amount in the bill, and not just back door, open-Treasury spending simply because nobody wants to go to the bother of determining how much money they will have in a particular bill.

I wish to re-emphasize, Mr. President, that this amendment, if adopted, is designed simply to transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education the specific program known as Headstart. It will take with it the people, the facilities, the ideas, the entire program that is now being operated by a sort of two-headed monster, into one organization where you can get administrative leadership and where you can put it together with the needed coordi-

nation so that it will fit into the educational system of our country.

I believe most of us would agree that Headstart, by and large, has been a pretty successful program. The interesting fact is that—if you look through the records and if you talk with the people who have been connected with it—when it has been most successful, it has been operated within the structure of the public school system. This is where it has been most successful. The objections that have come and the faults that have been evidenced in the Headstart program have been in the process of coordination between the Headstart program and the elementary schools. It is this lack of coordination which, in fact, has led to the committee adding to the present bill a new project which is designed to go into the school systems and assist children who have been in Headstart. The new project is called Follow-Through.

In my judgment, the public as a whole has a very high regard for the Headstart program. As I have said, the one major criticism has been the lack of coordination. This has been on the minds of both the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education; and during the past summer, the two departments got together and jointly announced grants totaling approximately \$2.5 million to 30 school districts, in order to follow through on the gains which have already been made in the Headstart program.

So, once again, here you are with a sort of two-headed monster, trying to administer one type of program and interjecting itself further and further into our school system.

I, for one, am convinced that one of the problems that we have in the bill now before the Senate is the interjection of the poverty people into the school system. It seems perfectly apparent to me, from reading the bill—I believe anyone who analyzes it carefully will come to the same conclusion—that with the Headstart program and then with the Followthrough program, what you are doing is taking the poverty people, who are operating at that level, and interjecting them directly into the public school systems.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I wonder if the Senator knows that at the outset of this program, in the State of California—this I consider one of the original causes of the problems for the entire program—the representatives who visited California went to the State superintendent of education and very carefully but forcefully explained that this program and any other programs funded with Federal moneys were to be handled by the representative of the OEO, and that the State superintendent of education would have no concern and have nothing to do with the use of these Federal funds, thereby creating an almost unworkable situation at the very outset.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am appreciative of the Senator's contribution. This is the problem that I believe is evident when we speak at the local level of the problems that Headstart and the school sys-

tem are having with the poverty people. I believe the Senator's example is a graphic one.

I could go on and on with respect to this subject. However, instead of continuing at length, I shall just comment briefly with respect to the manner in which the program would be administered and the people who are supporting the idea.

First of all, the money involved in the Headstart program, if transferred to the Office of Education, would be programed through the State school agencies. It is not so programed at this time. This, therefore, would put it right into the State agencies, who would determine which programs were going to continue, to what extent they were going to continue, and where the actual needs are. The people most intimately connected with the school system, the educational process of our young people, would therefore, State by State, be in charge of this program.

Second, the division of money among the States would be handled with exactly the same formula as it is handled now, with one exception. At the present time, the Director of the Poverty War has the right to allocate 20 percent of the total funds in any direction he wishes. I have cut the 20 percent down to 10 percent, recognizing that in some States or in particular areas of some States there may be a need for a little more money. It does not seem to me, however, that the Director of the poverty program or the Commissioner of Education should have unlimited discretion as to what to do with 20 percent of the total funds that are to be authorized and finally appropriated.

So I have cut that amount to 10 percent. Even this sum, it seems to me, would give them a substantial amount of flexibility. This in fact amounts, on the projection, to \$37.5 million, which is a large amount of money to put into the hands of one man to spend wherever he feels it is advisable; and in 1970, it would be some \$40 million.

I believe this is important. In other words, it would redirect the effort, through the Commissioner of Education, into the State agencies, which can then work with the people in the programs to maintain those programs that are operating, and to initiate them in conjunction with our school efforts and our educational efforts.

The next matter I wish to point out for the purpose of the record is the groups which have endorsed this idea.

We have had rather extensive hearings on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Education, of which I am a member and of which the distinguished Senator from Vermont is the ranking minority member.

The groups which testified on their bill were asked by me or others on the committee whether they endorsed this type of transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education. Those who endorsed the proposal were: Council of Chief State School Officers. These persons are chiefs of the edu-

cational processes in the States. They said yes, this should be done. The next organization was Great Cities for School Improvement.

The next organization is the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. The PTA is probably as well known in this country as any organization that I can think of. The next organization is the National Association of State Boards of Education. They said they were delighted. They said, "Yes; this is what we would like; that is where it should be. We do not know why it has not been done up to this time."

The next organization was the National Association of State School Boards. The State school boards said, "We are involved in this matter day in and day out in district after district all over the country and the problem we run into is lack of cooperation between the poverty worker and the school system. If we can get the matter under the Office of Education we will have solved that problem."

We have gotten in touch with the National Education Association. They have expressed support for the amendment.

Mr. President, all organizations intimately connected with this matter are in favor of my amendment. I shall repeat the organizations. The list includes: the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Great Cities for School Improvement, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Association of State School Boards. In addition, the National Education Association has also expressed support.

Mr. President, I wish to make the RECORD crystal clear on this matter. I would not want it said that I am trying to mislead anyone. No organization has actually reviewed this particular amendment, but they have endorsed the concept of the transfer.

I cannot see anything in the amendment which would jeopardize the program. I would simply move the program and give it more money and give the States more control over the program.

For those reasons it seems to me that the amendment is well worthwhile.

Mr. President, I shall reserve the remainder of my remarks for a later time when I shall request a live quorum before the vote is taken on this proposal.

(At this point, Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Colorado as a cosponsor of this amendment. I congratulate the Senator upon his presentation and on the thorough and most convincing explanation he has made. I believe nothing would be left in doubt as to whether the adoption of the amendment is for the overall general good of the entire program.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his support of the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Colorado for a most constructive and objective approach to this question. I think it is a long step in the right direction. I am glad that so far as Headstart is concerned he has delayed action for a year to make it possible for the school systems to be fully prepared to undertake this responsibility.

I might say that I have some reservations with respect to some of the provisions in the amendment. However, I think these are not too serious and if my fears are justified this matter can be worked out in conference.

I assure the Senator of my support.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I appreciate the support of the Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking minority Member on the Subcommittee on Education. His support is important to the amendment.

I was delighted to be able to discuss with the Senator from Vermont and with the staff some of the original problems we had to work out in connection with this matter. The Senator from Vermont has been most helpful in the presentation and development of the program.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may deliver a few brief remarks on this matter which I have prepared?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, as a co-author of this amendment, I strongly urge its adoption. Headstart is one program to which we can all point with pride. I have received letters and heard testimony from educators, interested citizens and parents, all attesting to the importance and the success of Headstart. Yet, even Headstart has not been without problems. Most of these problems in my judgment, can be traced to the administration of the Headstart program. And, Mr. President, this year, as the Members well know, the Office of Economic Opportunity is proposing a pilot Follow Through program. Follow Through is based on studies which seem to indicate that the "gains" made by the Headstart graduate may be "lost" unless some of the attributes of the Headstart program are continued in the early elementary school years. This raises a very serious question. Administration on the Follow Through program by the Office of Economic Opportunity may result in OEO forcing itself into the school systems across the country.

Almost every educational and manpower expert in the country has called attention to the duplication, confusion and conflict that presently exists in Federal manpower and education programs. Yet for the most part we, the Congress, and the executive branch have done nothing to unscramble the mess, to put together the pieces of the puzzle in a manner that will assure maximum coordination and program effectiveness and efficiency.

Headstart is an education program. Presently Headstart is funded both under the poverty program and under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. With both the Office of Education and the Office of Economic

Opportunity administering Headstart programs, needless duplication, double paperwork, and conflicting regulations must result. This cannot be permitted to continue.

Oh, Mr. President, I have listened to the arguments made by the Office of Economic Opportunity against the transfer of the Headstart program to the Office of Education. Stripping away the typical OEO rhetoric, their opposition boils down to the reluctance on the part of one bureaucracy to lose a program and particularly the funds to another bureaucracy. The Office of Economic Opportunity contends that the transfer of Headstart to the Office of Education would result in "more of the same." The implication is that the Office of Education would not be able to administer the program as effectively as the Office of Economic Opportunity. Well, Mr. President, I have listened since 1965 to the Office of Economic Opportunity's presentation to the Poverty Subcommittee, and I submit the record fails to disclose that the Office of Economic Opportunity possesses administrative ability superior to any other agency. Program administration has not been one of the shining attributes of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In examining the record of the Office of Economic Opportunity, one finds a record replete with administrative difficulties. The record shows that some of the most elementary administrative changes have come along only as a result of congressional prodding.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has given the Office of Education the responsibility of administering education programs. The Office of Education administers title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides Federal assistance aimed at improving the education of various poor and disadvantaged youngsters. If we cannot trust the Office of Education to administer education programs, such as Headstart, if to transfer the Headstart program to the Office of Education will produce "more of the same," then I submit we had better do something about the Office of Education. When we have a Federal agency assigned the responsibility of education, then those programs involving education should be administered by that agency. If the agency fails to carry out its responsibility, then the agency should be required to "shape up." If it fails to shape up, then its head should be removed, or maybe the entire agency should be replaced. Certainly, however, the answer is not to create another agency to carry out the same responsibilities and to duplicate its functions. Layer after layer, whether horizontal or vertical, of Federal bureaucracies is not conducive to efficiency and to effective programs.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am very much impressed with the astute observations now being made by the distinguished Senator from California, and with the remarks earlier of the dis-

tinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

During the years I was Governor of Wyoming, I had occasion to visit the Headstart operations in my State. I subscribe to the idea that is behind Headstart. I am aware, of course, of the accomplishments being made by that program.

I am in complete support of the amendment. I think there are a number of good reasons which have already been touched upon, and I only wish now to reemphasize them.

First, I think that, as is true with so many Federal programs, there has been a proliferation of activities among the various agencies so as to bring about a serious overlapping of management, direction, and administration—all of which add to the cost of the programs.

The facilities used in most Headstart programs in my State are those under the administration and supervision of the various school districts which, I think, adds to the reason for placing this program under the Office of Education.

The efficacy of the Headstart programs will be increased as the program starts out with youngsters of preschool age. It seems reasonable to me that greater progress will be made as these youngsters start their kindergarten and go into the first grade.

I believe also that the continuity of instruction that would result from this change would be all to the good.

It is a good program. I think it can be a far better program if we do away with the duplication of expense that currently characterizes it, if we provide the continuity of direction and interest which will be afforded the program if transferred to the Office of Education, and if we see that the teachers can solve the problems of these youngsters before they ever set foot in a public school as members of the kindergarten or first-grade classes.

For these reasons, I commend the distinguished Senator from California and the distinguished Senator from Colorado for sponsoring this amendment.

It will improve what has proven to be one of the best parts of the poverty program. If we are going to reach these people, to help those youngsters who come from homes where parents have not been able to afford them the same opportunities as the children in homes having a normal income, then I say we must continue the program.

We certainly will strengthen it, in my opinion, if we place it where it should be; namely, in the Office of Education.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my colleague from Wyoming.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I, too, wish to commend the distinguished Senator from California for his very able analysis of this problem and for the position which he takes, as well as the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

I had the privilege of voting for the first authorization and the first appropriation for the Headstart program.

I believe, and believe now, that it is one of the finest programs which have been presented. I supported it wholeheartedly when it was first presented and have been unfaltering in my support of the program.

I think that the approach of the amendment and the suggestions made by the Senators from California and Colorado are absolutely sound. The fact is, I find that in my State, many of the sessions of the Headstart program are held during the summer and other vacation periods, when the teachers can readily be taken from the public school system. This has worked out very well although, perhaps, it is not the entire solution to the problem.

Certainly, in my opinion, the Senator is on the right track. He has very ably expressed the sentiments of many of us, and I again commend him and support his amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his kind comments.

Mr. President, I, too, have the privilege of serving on both committees with my esteemed colleague from Colorado who, I assure you, Mr. President, deserves most of the credit for whatever we are about to accomplish here today. He has given a most complete delineation of the hearings and recitation of the evidence.

The Senate will recall that last year the Education Subcommittee recommended a transfer of the Headstart program to the Office of Education. We have heard witness after witness testify to the fact that they feel that the educators cannot only handle this program but can do it better than it is being done now. Typical of these statements was that of Superintendent Neil Sullivan of Berkeley, Calif. He endorsed the transfer in this manner:

Now I would strongly recommend that this committee consider taking the Head Start program and other educational programs out of the Office of Economic Opportunity and moving them over to the U.S. Office of Education, an Office equipped to handle the problems of education and not reestablishing a second organization in Washington and throughout the country that is not equipped to handle these problems.

This transfer was not done last year although we, the Congress, did transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education the adult education program. Since that transfer, I have heard no statements suggesting that the Office of Education has not been able to administer the adult education program. I have heard, however, that there has been a better administration of the adult basic education program. I think it is safe to assume, then, that the Office of Education can do a better job. I am old fashioned, Mr. President. I think if your tooth aches, you should go to a dentist. If your car breaks down, you go to a mechanic. And if your pipes leak, you get a plumber.

Mr. President, since we are dealing with taxpayers' dollars and have the responsibility to make certain that these hard-earned dollars are used and spent properly, it becomes necessary for us to bring about an end to the confusion and needless duplication; we must see to it

that States be required to deal with only one agency on one particular program. In the area of education, that agency is the Office of Education and it should be assigned the job of administering the Headstart program.

The time for the transfer is now. We cannot afford to delay any longer having a program administered by the second-best agency. We, therefore, should transfer the Headstart program to the Office of Education. This transfer will not only assure the successful continuance of the Headstart program, but it will be more likely to bring about a better followthrough in the elementary and secondary grades.

Mr. President, I know that OEO will contend that there has been the greatest of cooperation between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education. Unfortunately, I have not found this to be the case. Cooperation has given way to competition. Competition has resulted in needless delays, conflicting regulations and confusion among applicants for Headstart grants. A famous American once said:

The interest of childhood and youth are the interest of mankind.

I believe it is unfortunate when the interests of a bureaucracy prevent the Headstart program from being handled by the best qualified agency. It would be my purpose and desire to see that the interests of the children are served rather than the competition between two agencies.

Another reason for the transfer is to guarantee that Headstart program will be researched and its shortcomings altered. Anyone who has listened to the "snow job" that is annually given to the poverty committee by the Office of Economic Opportunity is greatly aware of the deficiencies in the Office of Economic Opportunity's evaluation system.

True, the Office of Economic Opportunity always says that by next year the data requested will be supplied; by next year the program will be better; and by next year all the wrongs will be righted. I, however, reply only that we have an old Mexican expression for that. They call it "manana." I think we have listened to "manana" long enough. I believe it is imperative that we conduct long term research on Project Headstart, that education programs be coordinated, and I am convinced that the Office of Education is the agency which is best equipped to administer the Headstart program.

I believe it is imperative that we continue this most successful program, Headstart, and that as it continues, we conduct long term research on the project to make certain that all possible improvements are being made. And I am further convinced, Mr. President, that the Office of Education is the proper agency which is best equipped and is properly constituted to administer the Headstart program and follow through with these youngsters in the elementary and secondary schools. In this way, we will be certain that we are initiating education in the proper manner and that the same agency will be charged with properly following through with these same youngsters.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to express my appreciation for the excellent statement which the Senator from California has just made. I think he highlights the problem with which we are faced—that is, competition between two agencies in Washington and the interjection of a really new agency into the school system, and the educational process.

The question is whether we are to continue that educational program in the wrong agency simply because we do not want to hurt anybody's feelings.

It is for these reasons that the Senator from Arizona, the Senator from California, and I have coordinated our efforts.

I think the Senator has done an excellent job in highlighting the issues. I appreciate his support.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it is a great honor to be a cosponsor of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. I think the suspicion of this necessity has existed in both committees. I think as the Senator and I heard both sides of the question and heard the witnesses, we were possibly more conscious of it and more sensitive than perhaps the general membership of this distinguished body. An indication that the change was suggested earlier is proof enough that now is the time that it be done, because I absolutely and truly believe that it would be of greater benefit to the children served by these several programs.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope this amendment to transfer Headstart to the Office of Education will not be adopted by the Senate, even though the Senator from Colorado has postponed the effective date of the transfer until 1969.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted. It may well be, in due course, that Headstart could be transferred to the Office of Education, but I say again, as I said last year, the time has not yet come. I want to buttress that statement. In the first place, Headstart is not primarily an educational program. It is a comprehensive child development program, which includes, in addition to the educational component, medical and dental services, nutritional services, social services, and parental involvement.

It may be argued—in fact, it was argued—by the Senator from Colorado that the ordinary school system can furnish adequate medical and dental services, such as the school lunch program, in many schools, and I guess most schools. There are guiding and counseling facilities in most schools today, and there are PTA's, as the Senator has said. But I believe anyone who has made a study in depth of how Headstart operates would be inclined to agree that the Office of Economic Opportunity has brought into being a new and imaginative institution which goes far beyond the kind of care these little children would receive if they were forced into the average public school system.

I have seen these programs, particularly in the South, where the racial problem is still quite acute in the educational field. I can assure my colleagues that it would be a disaster to turn the Head-

start program over to what is in fact, if not in name, in many school districts in the South, a thoroughly segregated educational system. The school boards are not ready for it. They do not want it. The teachers would resent the imposition of the load. And I would predict that to transfer this program to the Office of Education, and through it to the average school board in the South, would come pretty close to wrecking the program if it were done now, or even in 1969.

I see the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] in the Chamber. I noted that in Boston yesterday a lady—no doubt an estimable lady—got more votes than anybody else for mayor of Boston in the nonpartisan primary. She ran on a program that she did not want to see any Negro children bused into white schools, which would create an integrated situation. I am concerned about the Headstart program if that lady is elected mayor of Boston, as I understand she is very likely to be. I think we would throw into a northern city, where there is de facto segregation because of the housing pattern, another explosive situation where the Headstart program and the little children in it would be the innocent victims of an administrative shift, which, to my way of thinking, is very hard to justify, in the immediate future.

I know in my own cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, and in other cities in the Commonwealth also, we have that same segregated pattern of housing. I deplore it. My former comrade in arms, Mr. Dilworth, who is now chairman of the Philadelphia School Board, says his most serious problem is to make some progress in raising the level of the educational effort in the largely Negro and Puerto Rican schools of the Philadelphia ghetto.

They are having trouble getting teachers; they are having trouble building enough schools; they are having all kinds of trouble with programs. They are having trouble with parents and with the PTA. I would hate to throw on that already overburdened school system the additional burden of the Headstart program.

I would point out, with all the emphasis I can command, that I do not believe that school systems in the North or in the South, in many instances, are presently capable of taking on a Headstart program, running it successfully, and preventing this really meaningful and successful experiment from being killed in the process.

As my second point, I think it is also clear that Headstart is a community action activity, and relies heavily on the services provided by other parts of the total community action program. That is spelled out in some detail on pages 2833 to 2844 of part 9 of the hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those pages of the hearings be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearings was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator CLARK. Well, I think that pretty well covers our overview of the community action programs. Now I believe we can get down to the specific programs. Mr. Shriver, I understand that you would like to deal

with Headstart for a while which, at least where I sit, is probably the most congressionally successful program. I don't think you need to spend too much time on it but we ought to make a record concerning Headstart. I think you should follow through in something which needs more treatment than Headstart, but you do it your own way.

Mr. SHRIVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Next to me is Jule Sugarman, who is the Associate Director of Headstart and has been since the start of the program. One of the reasons that I feel that it would be worthwhile to spend some time on Headstart as distinguished from Followthrough is because of the opinion of some legislators that Headstart would be just as effective within the Office of Education, let's say, as it is within community action. We have been attempting to explain our philosophy on this, at any rate, as to why Headstart is a great asset of community action and in fact is a community action program rather than a specific educational or health or other type program.

So in point of view of the record, anyway, we would like to have these aspects of Headstart emphasized.

Senator CLARK. That is right.

I would like to note for the record in the State of Mississippi you could not have any Headstart today. I think that is one specific instance where it is a good thing that Headstart is under OEO and certainly not under the local boards of education.

Mr. SHRIVER. I agree with that. It is not even limited to a special situation like that. Headstart has been very helpful to us at any rate, as a community action program in getting community action started, in getting people working together. Outside of the South there are people working together who never worked together before, were brought together because of their mutual interest in these children. From that has emanated a great many things to benefit community action.

Senator CLARK. See if I understand it. Your view is Headstart is not only an educational program for the young preschool children but it is also an educational program for the family involving health facilities and educational facilities for founding a good deal of other areas where in order to turn out a whole child you have to do something with the disadvantaged family. This is one reason why you don't believe that the Office of Education is as well qualified to deal with it as the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mr. SCHRIVER. As CAP. For example, one could suggest that the whole CAP operation just be taken out of OEO. What I am suggesting is that it be left in CAP because it has extremely fruitful connections in CAP. That is what I frankly would like to have Mr. Sugarman talk about. That is the reason we felt it is worth your attention.

Senator CLARK. I think you have a good point there. Let us know if you can develop this, to what extent Headstart programs are being operated across the country by local boards of education of a delegated basis.

STATEMENT OF JULE SUGARMAN, DIRECTOR, HEADSTART, OEO

Mr. SUGARMAN. I would be happy to do that, Senator. I might say we have Dr. Nolan Estes of the Office of Education with us and you may wish to ask him questions as well.

Mr. SHRIVER. This is Dr. Estes.

Senator CLARK. Happy to have you with us.

Mr. SUGARMAN. In response to your specific question, Mr. Clark, the proportion of programs varies between summer and full year. The summer programs now serve about 500,000 children. There are roughly two-thirds operated by public schools, 10 percent by private schools, and the remainder by private nonprofit agencies.

The full year programs are increasingly

more popular and there is a growing interest in them on the part of the communities. There are now some 200,000 children enrolled. Less than one-third of the programs are operated by public school systems, about 10 percent by private school systems and the remainder by private nonprofit agencies, about 29 percent of them by community action agencies directly and about 26 percent by other private and nonprofit agencies.

Senator CLARK. Is that because the 4-year Headstart program can not find space in the public schools?

Mr. SUGARMAN. I think it is a little broader than space. I think they have space problems but I think the schools face numerous challenges and many of them feel they are not ready to take on this kind of program at this time. There are parts of the country in which the interest does not really exist among educators for preschool programs and other parts of the community have sprung forth to take their place.

Senator CLARK. Do you have any criteria by which you could objectively measure the success to date of the Headstart program?

Mr. SUGARMAN. Yes, I think we do have a good deal of data, Senator, that is beginning to accumulate.

Let me just try to lay out for the committee a sort of consensus picture of what this data shows. There are wide ranges in what it shows with some internal contradictory evidence. However, in general, the research says the child who comes into Headstart is substantially below the advantaged child in his development. If you use a scale of 100, he is down somewhere around 80 or 85. After he has been in Headstart he is up to the 90-to-95 range. He is below the average child but still significantly better than when he came into the program.

Senator CLARK. Are you talking nationally?

Mr. SUGARMAN. Yes.

Senator CLARK. It must be a wide geographical variation.

Mr. SUGARMAN. Tremendous. You may find one child that tests at 150 and another tests at 60, but if you put all the figures together and try to extract a synthesis from them that is what you get.

It is particularly true that the child who was the worst off when he started is one who gains the most in the program and that is, interestingly enough, particularly true for boys. Boys seem to gain much more from Headstart than do girls.

After the child has been out of Headstart for a few months or a year he tends to lose some of the gains which he has achieved during the Headstart program, a fact which we attribute largely to the kind of program into which he goes in the school system, whether it be kindergarten or first grade. He does not slip back to his original level but he does not maintain the level of gain that he first achieved in the program.

Senator CLARK. Let me interrupt. I neglected to ask that the chart "Headstart Community Action Program" should be printed in the program beginning with your remarks.

Mr. SUGARMAN. Fine.

The material subsequently supplied follows:

"HEADSTART—A COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

"Volunteers.

"New careers/teacher aides.

"Parent involvement—100,000 as workers or volunteers.

"Support of Community Action Agencies.

"Tied to other CAP Family Programs.

"Health, nutrition, psychological services, education, etc.

"In FY 1968:

"Children Served:
 Summer ----- 520,000
 Full Year ----- 218,000
 Follow-Through ----- 190,000
 Volunteers ----- 125,000

"Programs established in 2,150 communities."

Mr. SUGARMAN. Beyond that the research shows that there are very substantial health problems among children in Headstart. In the dental care area there is an appalling degree of neglect and we have spent a good deal of effort and money in trying to correct some of our dental deficiencies.

Senator CLARK. If the program has received it from the Office of Education, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it would not be possible to continue those dental services that are being proposed under OEO?

Dr. ESTES. It is possible. We do have some programs that provide these services; however, we would find it extremely difficult because of our emphasis on the educational component. If you look at the total amount spent in title I, we spent only 2.3 percent on health services, about 2.3 percent as compared to much larger amounts in Headstart, which shows the difference in the thrust between Headstart and title I.

Senator CLARK. But you are closer to the Office of Health than OEO is in the Offices of President. Why wouldn't you find it just as easy to walk across the aisle to talk to your health people?

Dr. ESTES. There are 44 agencies.

Mr. SHRIVER. Here is our favorite dentist.

Dr. ESTES. There are 44 agencies in Government.

Senator CLARK. Most of the dentists are over in the Department of Defense, aren't they?

Mr. SHRIVER. We have the best dentist.

Dr. ESTES. In the area of education, I would say we had a closer working relationship with OEO than we do with any of the agencies which are within our own department or in the other departments of Government.

Senator CLARK. It does not make sense administratively, does it? I mean it really does not. There is Secretary Gardner sitting up over HEW and you tell me you have closer relationships with OEO than you have with Health?

Dr. ESTES. I beg your pardon, sir. I didn't mean it that way. I said we had as good or better relationships with OEO as with other branches of Government.

Senator CLARK. Now let's get back to you, sir.

Mr. SUGARMAN. I was saying that the general health picture is one of having a large number of children with problems who in the course of an ordinary family will get attended to but in the history of these children have not been attended to. The rates of incidence of health problems are not terribly higher than in an advantaged home except in certain specific areas like anemia and parasitic infections and things of that sort. But on the other hand, if these problems continue to be neglected they become serious problems.

The other thing that I think we have been most encouraged about in our research and evaluation to date is the very substantial interest that parents are showing in the program and the fact that are beginning to participate not only in Headstart but as their children go on into the school system. We think this is terribly important for the whole effort that we are making here.

I might say that evaluation is a very difficult job from the technical point of view and we have spun a lot of wheels trying to find the best way to do this. We have now put the major thrust of our effort in 13 regional research and evaluation centers which are all university based which will give us an on-going capacity to try to search out answers to our problems and ways that we can move in the future.

I might refer to the chart on the wall here which has been inserted in the record, the chart headed "Headstart and Community Action Program," and talk about what Mr. Shriver had to say. I have a fondness for

saying that Headstart is community action from the ground up, community action in the sense that when a Headstart program operates well it does all the things on a small scale that the community action agencies ought to do on a large scale. It involves the parents in decisionmaking. It relates professionals to parents in constructive ways and gives both a sense of really working together. It provides very substantial career opportunities for persons from the target areas.

Incidentally, I think we are making great progress in employing nonprofessionals and that again is having an impact on the school systems. For example, in the city of Cincinnati there have been nonprofessional aids in the schools system in Cincinnati for a number of years. But traditionally they have been relegated to relatively minor roles, putting away papers and hanging up wraps and things of that sort. When the nonprofessionals were introduced into the Headstart program and the school system, which was running the Headstart program, say what could be done with them, they began to change their whole approach to the nonprofessionals in the school system.

We have had just a fantastic amount of volunteer effort in support of the Headstart program and it is our belief that for every hour of paid employment that OEO has financed in the Headstart program there has been an equivalent time of volunteer time given by people in the local communities. I had really expected there would be some fall off in the amount of volunteer effort as the program grew older but that does not seem to be the case thus far and most communities report they have all the volunteers that want to help in the program.

Headstart is, of course, a comprehensive program in the kinds of services that it offers to the child and his family. I think one of the things we are learning a great deal about in this program which has relevance to the Follow Through program as well is how the educators and the social workers and the doctors and the nurses and the nutritionists and the psychologists can all work as a team together with the parent, the director, and the nonprofessionals.

Senator CLARK. I think you make a good case for the kind of program that Headstart is or that you hope it will become, but I am going to have to meet it on the floor of the Senate for the argument.

That is all very well but why can't that be done just as well under the supervision in the Office of Education? Why can't it?

Mr. SUGARMAN. Well, I think that the answer really is one that Mr. Shriver has suggested. It is not which agency runs the program but its integral relationship to other parts of the community action effort.

As Mr. Shriver has suggested, there are literally hundreds of communities which have Headstart as the primary program for their community action agency. If they were excluded from the operation of the Headstart program, then it is very likely that they could go out of existence or lose the forward thrust that they have thus far.

Second, OEO has a tradition and experience of dealing a little bit differently with communities than does the Office of Education.

As you know, we do not channel programs through State education agencies, for example, or through any other State departments, but rather work directly with local agencies. We do have the experience and the policy of setting certain kinds of quality standards and of imposing upon communities certain requirements in order for programs to be funded. This tends to be less true in the Office of Education.

But basically it is this continuing dialog which ought to exist between the community action agency and the Headstart program

that we see as fundamental to the maintenance in OEO.

Senator CLARK. Is that about all you need to say about Headstart?

Mr. SUGARMAN. I think so, unless you would like to proceed to Followthrough.

Senator CLARK. It seems to me, Mr. Shriver, this is as good a time as any to get you on the record on what is one of the knottiest problems which confronts us, which is whether it would not be better to have OEO shed all of its operating responsibilities and become a planning organization with real coordinative authority. What I mean by real coordinative authority, have the OEO given the same status as the President himself delegating to you as the head of OEO the job of coordinating the activities for all the other departments in the name of the President.

Many of the professional administrators tell us if you cannot have satisfaction on the line service that you will be better off if you were doing the overall planning and also the direction of priorities and the setting of standards as opposed to the action of the operation of these various programs. I think we ought to have on the record a response from you to that suggestion because we are certain to have to meet on the floor.

Mr. SHRIVER. I think that the answer lies more in the factual situation than it does in political theory. I think that the personalities involved, the length of time during which an agency has been in existence, what the President wants, since he is the Chief Executive, are considerations more important than the theory. Theoretically one could say that the observations you have just made coincide with the public administration policy. My own impression, however, is that Presidents don't always necessarily follow exactly what Woodrow Wilson's school thinks best. Consequently, I don't think that it is very helpful in a practical situation to discuss what the theoretically most desirable solution is from a practical point of view.

Senator CLARK. I am not at all sure I could sell this present setup on the theory that that is what the President wants. It may be all right for me, it is certainly all right for you, but I am not sure that is going to go down with the Congress.

Mr. SHRIVER. I am not sure it is, either. All I am trying to say is that his title is Chief Executive, among other titles, and that it is his decision as to how the thing should be established, which means, in the final analysis, the executive branch decides to issue.

Now, as a matter of fact, these alternative ways of organizing or separating these functions have been considered at great length over a period of at least 3 years by the President and the current configuration is the one he likes, I am not saying necessarily it is worthy of a Ph. D.; on the other hand, it is what he prefers. I don't think pragmatically it has failed to work. I think it has worked for the most part except that I do agree with some people who have said that its coordinating authority should be increased. We have attempted to do this, at least to a modest extent, in the current bill that we have presented to the Congress.

Senator CLARK. But you don't really change that situation. You are the coordinator of the whole war on poverty under the old law and proposal No. 2 but you still don't have any authority to tell Cabinet officers what to do. Unless and until you get that authority I don't think the coordinating is apt to be terribly effective, do you?

Mr. SHRIVER. But there is only one person in the Government who has the authority to tell his own Cabinet what to do.

Senator CLARK. That is why I was making the suggestion that you be given the right to speak in the name of the President, which you don't presently have.

Mr. SHRIVER. All the people who have special authority to be of assistance to these

people normally have the right to speak in the name of the President, but it is obvious to some individuals that some people seem to have more authority for the President to speak than others in an adjoining office. So it is not a question of a title and it is not a question of a legal thing because I believe that no law could be drawn which would automatically force the President to delegate a particular part of his power to somebody regardless of who it is. It is not a question, therefore, of the title; it is a question of the actual operations.

Senator CLARK. One of our staff studies recommends that the President should be the Chairman of the Economic Opportunity Council and as Chairman would have the right to delegate anybody he wanted to—the Vice President, you, anybody else—the power to speak in his name and that in this way you could get authority to coordinate as opposed to merely permissive coordination as at present. What do you think of that?

Mr. SHRIVER. I think it would be safe for anybody to think that the President has considered that and for reasons best known to himself perhaps he has up until now decided against that.

Senator CLARK. But one of the problems is that maybe that Congress makes this decision.

Mr. SHRIVER. I am not saying that it is a wrong decision or that Congress cannot make it. All I was trying to observe was that the President has had that thought go through his mind, I think.

Senator CLARK. But I want you to tell us why you don't think it would be wise for the Congress to do it.

Mr. SHRIVER. I think in the final analysis the President is either going to make it work or not and we have had experience, I think, in this country of Congress actually setting up a power and then the Chief Executive or other branches of the executive not using the power. This is not because it is unlawful but because it is the way a particular man in that office there wants to operate. So we have come forward, Mr. Chairman, with at least one modest improvement in the coordinating authority involved which is merely to establish a permanent staff for the Economic Opportunity Council whose singular purpose would be to operate to bring problems up to the level of the Council in a manner where they could be resolved there, and if they are not resolved there then they could be moved higher.

Up until now our agency itself has had to supply the staff for the Economic Opportunity Council and they have had six or seven additional jobs. The result is that the staff work for the Economic Opportunity Council has not been as good as it should have been. Issues do not get crystalized and brought to the Economic Opportunity Council in an actionable form.

I personally believe it would be a substantial step in the direction Congress appears to want to go. At least this line of questions appears that you might want to go in that direction if we—

Senator CLARK. No. I think we ought to make a record.

Mr. SHRIVER. I hope I am making a helpful record. Dr. Levine just sent me a note with the observation on it that the power of agencies, like the Bureau of the Budget itself and of the National Security Council itself, varies greatly between different Presidential administrations. Sometimes the Bureau of the Budget has a great deal of power, sometimes it does not; sometimes the National Security Council does and sometimes it does not, even though the law is not changed in the process.

Senator CLARK. I think this is true. One of the things that disturbs me is that at the moment the Bureau of the Budget through its fiscal powers and budgetary powers is able to exercise power direction over the poverty

programs, which I don't believe they should. If you had this opportunity council with a little bit of power then I would think you might have a countermand of power of the Bureau of the Budget which would be very useful.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, it has been suggested in hearings before this committee previously that the device be adopted, such as a national antipoverty budget, which you might call a subsidiary part of the regular budget and which would give this agency a great deal more control over the poverty program than now exists.

The fact is that as it now operates it is very much like, if not identical to, other aspects of the budget; namely, that the President in the final analysis is the budget officer who makes the allocation.

Senator CLARK. This is true, but the budget deals primarily with dollars and you deal primarily with people. My objection is that here is an agency which deals almost entirely with dollars, balancing one, balancing the budget, and they should not be making these decisions, it does not seem to me, except to the extent that the President pulls the string on them and says so much money and no more.

Mr. SHRIVER. Let me say for the record, since I am looking at the picture as a whole, that the Bureau of the Budget works very closely in cooperation with us and has not restricted itself or shouldn't, in my judgment, merely to balancing the budget by working around with figures. They have an extremely able staff, a staff which has been very helpful to us, and which addresses itself to substantive matters in addition to money matters. It certainly has been a constructive force rather than an opposition force with respect to OEO.

Senator CLARK. Now let's get back to this staff you are recommending. What would be the size of the staff and what would be the appropriation you think they would need for salaries and other expenses to operate?

Mr. SHRIVER. The actual size of staff has not been worked out in final detail but our thoughts were somewhat along this line; that the senior staff person would be at the highest career civil service level, which is GS-3. That would be deputy GS-16 and perhaps as many as three or four additional officers plus the clerical assistants and stenographic assistants to make them effective. So we would be talking about a total officer complement, to use that phrase, of maybe eight people supplemented with appropriate space and clerical assistance.

Senator CLARK. You have them physically located in your building as opposed to in the White House?

Mr. SHRIVER. Frankly, we have not come to that issue. It is not so much a question, I believe, of where they are physically located, such as space problems in the executive branch, but more a question of their relationship to the White House rather than where they are physically located.

Mr. LEVINE. Mr. Chairman, could I add something? As I understand, your original question, it was substitution of such a staff for an independently funded OEO. I would like to add something on the other part of the question, on the need for independent funding of OEO's own program. I think the EOC staff we are requesting is an excellent idea if added to the independent funding of OEO programs.

In looking at this I think it depends on what kind of theory you take. If you take bureaucratic theory you took for a nice organization chart. If you look at the theory of bargaining, however, I think the answer to why OEO comes out fairly clearly, you need an independent national agency, and particularly independent local agencies like community action authorities, under the supervision of this independent national agency as bargainers with and for the poor,

that this works only with some independent programs.

Coordination of Cabinet officers is a nice idea, but unless you can do the kinds of things we have been doing like innovating, coordination at the local level, I am talking primarily at the local level, and occasionally, say in places like Mississippi, offering some rivalry to existing organizations, I think the whole poverty effort becomes much less effective politically than the existing bureaucracies of various sorts. It is very important to have an independent agency and I think it is important to have a director of this agency reporting to the President.

Senator CLARK. What you are saying, in effect, is that the administrative or political science theory, if you can't be both staff and line, is just not right that you can plan and operate, too. That is what you are saying, isn't it?

Mr. LEVINE. Yes, sir. I think that is right.

Mr. SHRIVER. Could I add a point there?

Senator CLARK. Surely.

Mr. SHRIVER. The Federal Information Service that we have is an extremely helpful tool both to the agency and to OEO's coordinating role. In other words, under that authority to gather information we have, in a sense, the intelligence arm of this war and until we get more intelligence we are not going to be able to prosecute the total war in the future as ably as we can. That is an extremely important aspect of our total job. It gets very little attention over here and I wanted to mention it for the record because it is very important.

Senator CLARK. You certainly could still keep your intelligence services, every staff agency has its own intelligence service serving its commanders.

Mr. SHRIVER. Excuse me. What I was talking about was the Federal Information Service which covers the whole domestic budget. I think it is now about \$60 billion worth of expenditures by the Federal Government on the domestic side, which are now being processed through the Federal Information Service. That is the first comprehensive view of the totality of the Federal Government's action domestically in the United States, leaving out the Department of Defense. Everything else is there.

Senator CLARK. Well, to whom does the Federal Information Service report?

Mr. SHRIVER. To us.

Senator CLARK. OEO?

Mr. SHRIVER. That is right. It effectively helps us to look for gaps and the necessity of or lack of necessity for new programs, but it is also very helpful to this economic program. In fact, it was because of the Federal Information Service or system that we were able to collect for the first time exactly what was going on or not going on in a State like Mississippi, so that 18 months ago in January 1966 we inaugurated a program of special concentration on Mississippi. That was made possible because we gathered together everything that we were doing and what we were not doing and then took some specific steps.

Senator CLARK. Now that you brought that up, I think we ought to have a little more in the record about it. How many people are employed by the Federal Information Service and what is its budget? If you have not got it, could you furnish it for the record?

Mr. SHRIVER. I should have. Just a minute. Could you get it for the record?

Bob Cassidy is the Assistant of OEO for Management.

Mr. CASSIDY. I don't have it.

Mr. SHRIVER. I just goofed.

Senator CLARK. Let me call your attention to your own congressional presentation which has one—

Mr. SHRIVER. Thank you.

Senator CLARK. It looks like a two-page summary called "The Federal Information

System," which I would like to have printed in the record at this point.

The document referred to follows:

"THE FEDERAL INFORMATION SYSTEM"

"The vast resources of the Federal Government are administered through a variety of programs managed by all Federal departments and agencies and operated in the states, counties and communities. Until recently, it was not possible to ascertain which of these programs was available for use in an area of interest, nor in fact was the amount of funds at work known even to those most closely associated with the area. Indeed, because of the complexities of Government it was not possible for even the granting agencies to determine the extent to which other Federal programs might be influencing the economy or satisfying the need of an area of interest.

"With full recognition of the implication of this committee, OEO undertook the compilation and production of a Catalog of Federal Programs for Individual and Community Improvement, a document which accomplished for the first time a merger under one cover of information on more than 260 programs funded by Federal Departments and Agencies. The universal acceptance and value of this document is attested by the large and continuing demand for it. More than 250,000 copies have now been printed and distribution is continuing at a steady pace. In the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act the Congress directed that OEO update and republish this document, incorporating the newer programs born of later legislation.

"Under the direction of the Economic Opportunity Council and with the aid of the Bureau of the Budget, the OEO Information Center set out early in 1966 to design and to develop a system which would collect operating program information covering the programs contained in the Catalog; process this information in a compatible format; and display it in a manner which would make it more generally useful. The results of this effort have been most rewarding and have led to the development of the Federal Information Exchange System.

"The Federal Information Exchange System, as the title implies, collects information from all Federal Departments and Agencies and develops a central data bank for use by all Federal, state, and local agencies as well as the private sector. At present over 160 programs, representing 16 agencies, are included in the system, and as the effort continues the data base is expanding. Information is currently available on programs funded at the county level, although in some instances the departments are having to revise their systems to report at the county level. Not all programs are reported at present in the depth of detail necessary for the ideal system. Publication of the first official reports from the system has evoked a sizeable amount of appreciation from the recipients and has in effect amplified the true nature of this effort—the concept of Information Exchange. The system is now capable of responding to requests for feedback of the information in many forms, and it is already being used for planning purposes.

"Already it is obvious that much more needs to be done to make this system even more useful and meaningful. A further development has been the compilation, production and publication of a complete set of socio-economic profiles covering every county in the United States. These profiles describe the social and economic characteristics of each county with appropriate indicators of the strengths and weaknesses and with numerous comparisons to national and state experience. Thus, it is now possible to identify the problems in each community.

"The next step, to be accomplished during FY 1968, is to blend these problem definitions with the previously published program

information to determine shortfalls and overages. With this information, planners and budgeters can begin to redirect their programs to better satisfy the need and to produce greater return in the relief of suffering, misery and want.

"Another major effort now being undertaken will have major importance on the Federal Information Exchange System. This effort involves working closely with the State Governments to develop a system for making optimum use of the data available (or which could be available) within the State Departments. In some instances this may involve the design of entire collection and processing systems; in others only a redirection of present efforts may be needed to permit the States to make better use of their information.

"OEO is spearheading this effort in the belief that if the states have better information they can then do a better job of planning and budgeting. At the same time, information thus collected by the states can be shared or exchanged with the Federal Government and, to the extent appropriate, with other states. Present plans call for the involvement of six states on a pilot test basis, with intent to assist the states in the installation of operational systems. Information which can be added to the federal data bank as a result of this effort will fill a major void. The extension of this plan to other states will greatly improve the responsiveness of the system and will enhance the Federal Government's information posture, providing in one place information hitherto unavailable from any source."

Senator CLARK. That does not give us either the staff or the dollar amount. If you could furnish that at a later date we would be grateful to you.

Mr. SHRIVER. I can make a guess. There are somewhere around 30 people there, at a cost of about \$2.7 million a year.

Senator CLARK. Well, if that turns out to be inaccurate, please correct the record.

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes; we will get it accurate. I just wanted to give an approximate idea what it was.

Senator CLARK. Now if we are going to follow out this staffing of the committee I was speaking about, the coordinating committee you were speaking about a few moments ago, we are going to have to get you some more supergrades, aren't we?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, sir; or they have to be assigned to somebody else and delegated to us.

Senator CLARK. Of course you know this is one of problems with the other body.

Mr. SHRIVER. What?

Senator CLARK. With the House. You know that horrible row we had last year about the supergrades.

Mr. SHRIVER. Excuse me. I was really wrong. They have 89 people there now. That shows you how things can grow.

Senator CLARK. Our books show 98.

Mr. SHRIVER. That is what is authorized, but they don't have them.

Senator CLARK. I see.

Mr. SHRIVER. Eighty-nine is what they have.

How much money?

Ninety people. They hired somebody yesterday, I guess.

Mr. LEVINE. Three and a half million dollars.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, a little closer to that, \$3.5 million.

Senator CLARK. Mr. Patricelli, do you have a question?

Mr. PATRICELLI. Mr. Shriver, I understand this staff would report to you as Chairman of the Economic Opportunity Council. Is that correct?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, or to Congress. Whoever the Chairman would be.

Mr. PATRICELLI. Do you think it would be possible for a staff which is appointed by

you and reports to you to develop alternatives on a Government-wide basis, alternatives that might delegate OEO programs to other departments and agencies? Could this staff function effectively in presenting options in the same way, for example, that the Bundy staff supposedly acted in presenting foreign policy options to the President?

Mr. SHRIVER. Theoretically, I think you are right. On the face of it it looks like a conflict of interest. In fact, however, it is true that our own staff, letting that theoretical staff alone for a minute, has developed proposals to us for spinoffs and delegations and we have done it without any pressure from anybody. I mean a letter of actual history that is actually what is happening. I am not saying that the conflict is not latent there; all I am trying to say is up to now it has not reared its ugly head.

Mr. PATRICELLI. Would you agree that the staff might be freer to present options and alternatives if it did not report to you as Director of OEO but to a higher level?

Mr. SHRIVER. Surely.

Senator CLARK. Mr. Shriver, the staff has prepared a memorandum with additional questions on Headstart which I will not take time to have asked right now because I do want to move ahead. Our staff will furnish your people with these questions and perhaps you can provide answers.

Mr. SHRIVER. Be happy to.

Mr. CLARK. My third point is that the Headstart program is being operated in many of the schools at present. There is a wide area of flexibility given to the Office of Economic Opportunity, and, in point of fact, one-third of the full-year Headstart programs and two-thirds of the summer programs are presently being run by public school systems. This is being done on a delegation basis. The Office of Economic Opportunity can and often has delegated to school systems which it believes are competent and capable of handling the Headstart program the actual running of these programs for little children of 3, 4, and sometimes 5 years of age.

So the present flexible basis, I suggest, is far preferable to putting Headstart in a straitjacket and requiring it to be transferred to school systems, which, I say again, in many instances are not prepared to accept the responsibility with any reasonable hope of success.

My fourth point is that the Headstart programs are operated primarily by community action agencies directly, or their delegates, and should be. This is, as I said earlier, a typical community action activity which should be run at the grassroots level, by individuals primarily interested in the poverty program and not in the education of middle class and upper class youth—or even lower middle class youth, coming from families who could not conceivably be considered a part of the poverty population.

When you throw Headstart into the school systems, I suggest, too, you take all the emphasis on a successful attack on poverty out of the program, and you put it into the hands of individual administrators—principals, school teachers, doctors and dentists, if you like—whose concept of their obligation is to serve the children of the entire community, without regard to whether they are poor or not.

I think there is a need for advocacy for the children of the poor, which is the

great contribution which OEO is able to make.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thought perhaps that rather than wait until the Senator is through, and then make a talk of my own, I could engaged in a little colloquy with him at this point.

Mr. CLARK. I would be happy to.

Mr. DOMINICK. As to some points the Senator has raised which I think are of interest:

First of all, I would point out to the Senator that on page 4 of my amendment, we specifically provide, under section 6, that the State program, which would have to be approved by the Commissioner of Education, must provide "a balanced program to meet the educational, nutritional, health, clothing, and other unique needs of children from impoverished backgrounds in order for them to function at optimum levels in relationship to other children."

That is the exact wording, actually, in the poverty bill itself. What I am saying is that this is not educationally oriented; we are trying to approach the problem in the same way that they have already successfully done.

Mr. CLARK. I am aware of that, and I think if the Senator's amendment were to be adopted—which I hope it will not—that that is a useful provision.

I note, however, that the Senator from Colorado does not include any reference to the parents in that part of his amendment. I do not know whether he does anywhere else or not.

One of the major problems in connection with Headstart is to get the parents of these poor children to cooperate. As I said the other day, in many of their homes there has never been a book. In many of the homes, the knowledge of public health and sanitation is pretty rudimentary. Working with the parents is one of the major purposes in the Headstart program. It has been extraordinarily successful in most jurisdictions.

I do not think formal school systems could be expected to give that degree of concentrated attention to the parental needs of these children, if the program were incorporated into the average school system.

Mr. DOMINICK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. On page 7 of the amendment, under subsection (c), where we are talking about the question of where most of the plans are set up, I think we have taken care of most of the problems the Senator from Pennsylvania has brought up as to the question of whether or not the program could go forward in public school systems, because that subsection provides that if no satisfactory plan is submitted, or no acceptable plan, or no plan at all, then the Commissioner is authorized to go directly to the qualified community action board, or, in any community where there is no board, directly to the educational agencies.

That would permit the Commissioner to have considerable flexibility in those

areas where there might otherwise be some problems. That is the purpose for including subsection (c). I was not sure whether the Senator from Pennsylvania had had an opportunity to analyze that subsection.

Mr. CLARK. Actually, I was aware of its existence, but I am happy to have the explanation of the Senator from Colorado.

I suppose this is as good a place as any to say that I am really most skeptical about this administrative scheme of State planning. I would suggest, without attempting to be invidious or to name States where I believe this to be true, that there will be a number of States where State Boards of Education not only would not supplement, with an adequate State plan, a Headstart program, but probably are adverse to the whole Headstart concept for, quite frankly, racial reasons.

When I was in Mississippi this spring, I discovered that there had been one white mother in Jackson—a liberal woman—who had been willing to enroll her child in a Headstart program in that part of Jackson, Miss.

She was threatened and they attempted to ostracize her. She had a great deal of courage. She kept the child in the program. However, to have one child out of approximately 30 engaged in a program in that manner is pretty unsatisfactory.

This happened because the community consensus in that area was such that we could not do much about getting the Headstart program rolling if it were going to be under the jurisdiction of a local school board.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, to complete my fourth point—

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I join the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, in opposing the amendment.

I should like to engage in a colloquy with the Senator for a few minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I should be delighted to do so.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it not a fact that there is greater interest in this program in Congress and among the people of the United States than in any other aspect of the poverty program?

Mr. CLARK. I think that is true. I am glad the Senator raised that point. I believe that the Senator from Colorado will agree with that, although he believes in his point that the program would do even better under the Office of Education. I disagree with that point of view.

I think that things are going good.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. It seems to me that the program is a great success. Everybody recognizes it as being a great success. The investigations made by every committee of Congress concerned with the matter have established that the program is a great success.

When we consider all of the criticism that has been leveled at the OEO and the poverty program, we realize there has generally been less criticism directed at this program than at any other.

The program has been administered well. It has been directed properly. It has accomplished a great deal of good. It seems to me to be very strange, when this program has been an effective program, has been administered properly, and has accomplished a great deal, and everybody recognizes that those who have administered it have shown a great deal of attention and compassion and understanding for the problem, to then say: "It has been such a success that we will take it out of the area where it is being properly administered and where it is doing well, and put it under the Commissioner in the Office of Education who has said, 'We are not tooled up to handle this program.'"

In an exchange between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Commissioner of Education, the Commissioner, when asked if the Office of Education could handle Headstart, said specifically that he did not think they could, that they were not prepared to do so.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I would like to read into the RECORD that part of the discussion had in the hearings on July 25, 1967, before the Senate Education Subcommittee on the 1967 amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Senator DOMINICK addressed a question to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, who would have supervision of this program if the amendment were agreed to. The question related to transferring this program. Mr. Howe replied:

I think that actually the operation of Headstart under OEO, under the present arrangement, makes a great deal of sense; that we are not geared up for it; that the flexibility that OEO has in dealing with the whole variety of community agencies that are offering Headstart programs is a well-established flexibility that would be more difficult for us to establish. And it seems to me that our cooperation with them in joint arrangements in which we offer title I preschool programs is working well.

So that I do not believe that the idea of making a transfer of Headstart to the Office of Education is one that ought to be pursued, for reasons of administrative efficiency, or for the operation of that program.

I think that these programs can go along as they are, and that there is good cooperation between these two major agencies.

That is a quotation from Mr. Harold Howe. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] pursued a similar line with Mr. Howe later in the course of the hearings and asked:

Is there any reason why the Office of Education could not operate the Headstart program on a grant basis similar for example, to title I—and thereby avoid the church-State conflict?

Mr. Howe replied:

I think our arrangements for handling private school pupils and handling the facilities to provide Headstart activities for pupils are somewhat less flexible under title I legislation than is the case with OEO legislation, and therefore, I think there might be a problem connected to private school pupils,

but I would assume that with new legislation that could be worked out.

I would assume that, with new legislation, that could be worked out.

I thank the Senator very much for calling that to my attention.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I should like to point out a couple of other points that I believe are important.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may temporarily yield the floor to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, first, we would be taking the program out of an agency in which it has been very successful and effective and placing it under a department that says it is not prepared to handle it.

Second, evidence compiled by the Office of Education concerning the experience with this kind of a problem in school systems all over the country makes it apparent on the face of it that they are not equipped to handle the problem.

The great cities of our Nation have known of the problem for decades. We have seen the results of their work. By the time a child in a slum school in the city of New York, or any of the other cities which has a large number of poor reaches the third grade, he is 1 year behind. By the time he reaches the sixth grade he is 2 years behind.

Between the fifth and eight grades, under our present educational system, the average child in a ghetto school loses 10 points in his IQ.

I would say that we should not be overwhelmed with the success and effectiveness of the educational system existing in our country as it pertains to the very poor.

Only three out of 10 children in poverty areas graduate from high school, and yet even those three who graduate from high school have only a 50-50 chance of having the equivalent of an eighth-grade education.

It seems to me that Headstart has been successful where it is. The Commissioner of Education says that it makes no sense to switch the Headstart program to the Office of Education because his agency is not equipped to deal with it.

If we look at the educational systems around our country, we have to recognize, as Commissioner Howe recognizes, that in other localities in the country and in the smaller cities of the country they have no programs which have been imaginative or very effective in dealing with this kind of problem.

Moreover, there are some areas of the country where the present approach to Headstart is especially important, areas where there is a conflict between those who are running the Headstart program and the State authorities.

When we were in Mississippi, as the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, we examined a very good program—the Child Development Group of Mississippi.

If this group, the Child Development Group of Mississippi, and certain other efforts in that State and in other States were changed over and put under the

office of education of the particular State involved, there is no question that it would destroy the effectiveness of the program.

Anybody who looks at the Headstart program under the direction of CDGM is impressed by the program and what they have done. Anyone examining the program will notice how the program has touched the lives of these children. If that program is changed or transferred over to the control of the State department of education, it would be destroyed. We have to recognize and face up to that fact.

Furthermore, the Headstart program is more than just an educational program. It has an effect on the parents. It brings in the parents. It has an effect on the community. That has not been done at the present time in the regular school systems, at least not in the major cities of the United States. The child and the parent are remote from the direction of the regular educational system.

That is one of the advantages of the Headstart program. If we change the Headstart program and transfer it over to a Department of Education, we will lose all of that. We will lose the participation of parents, the idea that it will be a year-round program, and the idea that this is really a program which is supposed to be controlled by the people in the local community.

It is not directed by somebody from Washington or from the State capital or from the mayor's office. I believe that is extremely important, and that is one of the reasons why this program has been so effective.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to mean that, as has been explained by the Senator from Colorado when I believe the Senator from New York was absent from the Chamber, there would be no change except an immediate change in the top of the administration?

The program as it is presently set up is working so well that no one, least of all the Senator from California, would suggest change in this program. The heads of the departments of education would have the good sense and judgment not to destroy this program, which is so important.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have several points I should like to make in connection with that matter.

The Office of Education says it is unequipped to deal with it. There is no question that in many of the cities we have toured, the local departments of education or boards of education would be unequipped to deal with this matter.

Furthermore, under the amendment—I have read the minority views—

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I just finish my points?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not want to lose the point the Senator from New York just made.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not want the Senator to lose it, either. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MURPHY. I have the good fortune to serve on both committees, and the evidence that we have had from the educators, the heads of departments of education indicate that they are equipped, that they are quite ready, and that they are capable and could do it. They believe, as I believe, that they could do it just as well and possibly lead into the followup programs with less dislocation and less friction for the children.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am not familiar with that. I am familiar with the testimony of the Commissioner of Education in which he said specifically that they were not prepared.

Mr. MURPHY. He is on the same team. I am on the side of the taxpayer and the people. Actually, the Commissioner of Education must protect his brothers in bureaucracy. Otherwise, his pencils would be dull.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator from California went to Mississippi with us and recalls the organization, the Child Development Group of Mississippi.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe at that time he said some words in praise of that organization and the effectiveness of some of their programs, particularly the Headstart program.

As the Senator knows, and as he pointed out when we were in Mississippi, they have operated independently of the State, and that is one of the reasons why they have been effective. Under the proposed amendment, that would no longer be possible.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I finish?

Mr. DOMINICK. I just want the Senator from New York to know that what he said is not true. I suggest that he read the amendment again.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I finish?

Mr. DOMINICK. Do not come in and say that you could not continue it, because that is not the fact.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I should like to point out the section of the amendment which I believe raises the problem about the CDGM. It is section 702 on page 3, and it says the State plan is to be one which "sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 701 will be used solely to make grants to community action boards."

In the first place, CDGM is not a community action board or a delegate agency of a community action board. So it could not be funded under that provision.

Section 702 goes on, on page 4, and says "or in any community where there is no qualified community action board," the funds are to go "to local educational agencies to assist them in carrying on preschool programs which, under subsection (b), are eligible for assistance under this title."

Therefore, Headstart funds would have to go through the State department of education, which in this case would be the State of Mississippi, which is opposed to CDGM, and on to the local schools, which are also opposed to CDGM.

Mr. DOMINICK. Will the Senator refer to the page from which he is reading?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have read from the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. On what page?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. On what page?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Page 3, section 702(a) (2).

Mr. MURPHY. While the Senator from Colorado is looking for the place, will the Senator from New York permit me to say that I do not actually recall having enough knowledge of the activities of this group in Mississippi. I only recall the experience in Mississippi in which we discovered, jointly, that people there were starving. And I am ashamed to say that, so far as I can learn, I do not believe that problem has been rectified.

With all due respect to the Senator, I am quite certain that I did not make extensive remarks with respect to the other item, because I would have no knowledge. Under the proposal I coauthored, there would be no change in the operation. There would be merely change in the top responsibility, and it would be passed from OEO to the Department of Education.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I say to the Senator that I do not believe all of us can remember every witness or everything is said at a hearing; but it is a fact that while the Senator from California was present, representatives of this organization, CDGM, did testify. I believe we can obtain the testimony. I believe we all were impressed with what they were doing. The Senator might not have attended it. I do not question that. But the fact is that it does change—I just use this as an example, and I am sure there are other examples—it does change the possibility of an organization such as this operating effectively or successfully in the State.

Mr. MURPHY. I should like to say once more that we are writing of legislation to affect the 50 States. I understand that in certain States, certain areas, there will be problems. But in the writing of legislation for 50 States, I must be guided by the testimony I have heard, as a member of the Subcommittee on Education, which convinced me that the educators, the educational groups around the country, are ready and believe they are capable of doing the job.

I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from California. I am on that committee as well, and I know how conscientious the Senator from California has been about these matters.

Mr. DOMINICK. In answer to the point about which we were speaking earlier, I cite subsection (b), on page 5, which states that a preschool program shall be eligible for assistance if it is carried on by, or under contract arrangements with, a community action board.

This would take care of the system in existence in Mississippi. If that would not take care of it, we reserve 10 percent to the Commissioner of Education,

which he could distribute in any way he wished. He could do it directly from the Commissioner of Education to the child development and growth group about which the Senator is speaking.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I said that it really does not deal with this problem, because there are other organizations such as this around the country which are not delegate agencies, and do not operate by contract with community action boards. They, like CDGM, are funded directly. Nor is it at all clear to me from the language of the amendment that it does give the Commission the authority to fund a group like CDGM directly.

The Senator from Colorado and I might disagree in this respect, but we cannot disagree with respect to the fact that if the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is adopted, many changes will be made in the manner in which the program is operated.

Mr. DOMINICK. I hope changes will be made, because they should be made.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. The Senator has well pointed out that the Headstart program has been rated a success by almost all those who testified. In addition to the assistance that is given to the child who participates in the Headstart program, as the Senator has also pointed out, the parents are directly affected. They are given an opportunity, under this program, to participate, and, in the nonprofessional jobs to become directly involved in the work of the Headstart program.

In addition, many other nonprofessionals from the community are hired to work in the program, and many volunteers from outside the community come in to help.

It seems to me that here we have a program which admittedly is successful and is working. To disrupt the program at this time would be a source of great discouragement not only to the parents of the children in Headstart but also to the country as a whole. We have had unfortunate experiences with some of the so-called poverty programs. But here we have a program which is working well, and to attempt to disrupt it in any way might be very injurious not only to Headstart but to the whole concept of a concerted effort to eradicate poverty in America.

Mr. President, I have great respect for the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. BROOKE. I have great respect for both of them and certainly, under normal circumstances, I would agree with them that the Office of Education would be the proper place for a program such as Headstart. This would be true under normal circumstances and in the best of all possible worlds. But let us face it. We do not have the best of all possible worlds. We know there will be serious problems if Headstart is taken out of the Office of Economic Opportunity and

placed under the Office of Education before they are ready to assume responsibility for it.

I wonder what provisions, if any, the Senator from Colorado would have in his amendment to protect the Headstart program from school systems that admittedly do not want to participate in such a program?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may answer the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, if this dislocation were a fact, why it would be fair to assume that the Office of Education would create a dislocation? Why assume this to be so and that it cannot be administered by someone other than OEO? I think sometimes an assumption of this type may be very good, but for all practical purposes, I do not think we should rush at it too quickly and assume it to be a fait accompli.

This program might be improved, and some of the problems about which the distinguished Senator is concerned, as I am, might be improved by the changes. I am not certain of this. I cannot assume that it would or would not. However, that would be my hope. I would hope from all of the evidence on both sides that it might work better.

Mr. BROOKE. I do not assume that the transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education would necessarily result in dislocation. I cannot make that assumption and I think the Senator from California is quite correct.

However, we do know that the Director of the Office of Education has said before the committee that his office is not in a position to accept the program at the present time.

We know from the record, and from the problems which many States have had with their own school systems, that they are not in a position to accept a Headstart program. We know the school systems in the country, generally speaking, are not able to bring in nonprofessional personnel to work in the community with the Headstart program. And they have had nothing in their programs to date to indicate they could be effective in the social and psychological fields, because they are almost entirely geared to the field of formal education.

If we admit that Headstart is more than an educational program, I think the assumption would be valid that there would be dislocation if we place it in the Office of Education rather than in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

My main point, however, is that Headstart is working under the Office of Economic Opportunity. It has been called a magnificent success. Why stop a success. We need more of it.

I say at this time that since the Office of Education is not able to take it, why not leave it there.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point to permit me to answer some of these points?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado and he, then, can yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to point out two things. First, one-third of all the full year Headstart programs are being operated by school systems now, and two-thirds of those are in the summertime. I cite as authority for this statement the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] who so stated on September 22, 1967, in a colloquy with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. There is already some experience in this field by our schools.

Second, this particular amendment would reserve 10 percent to the Commissioner of Education wherever he thinks and under such criteria as he thinks there should be, which gives flexibility to take care of specific problems.

Third, subsection (6) on page 4 of the proposal provides that the State plan must provide a balanced program to meet the "educational, nutritional, health, clothing, and other unique needs of children from impoverished backgrounds in order for them to function at optimum levels in relationship to other children."

Fourth, it provides, under section (5), that the program can be operated by or under contracts with the Community Action Board.

These safeguards are in here.

Finally, I would conclude by pointing out that in August 1966, Mr. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in his testimony before the Committee on Government Operations said, with respect to the Headstart program:

However, we are doing the same thing under title I and I think we in our Department believe that eventually all of these preschool efforts will have to find their home in our Department.

We transferred the work study program and the adult education program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education, and they are working fine.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would be happy to yield if I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. BROOKE. Would parochial schools and settlement houses be able to operate schools under the amendment?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes, by contract; under the State plan by contract with the Community Action Board.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts said that in Los Angeles the Headstart program is funded under ESCA. They are doing the work, they are getting along fine, and may be considered one of the best examples. I think the Senator's fears may be unfounded. There is great overlap already.

Mr. DOMINICK. If Senators will note the summary which is on the desk of each Senator, they will see that this matter has been endorsed by the Council of Chief State School Officers, Great

Cities for School Improvement, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Association of State School Boards, and the National Education Association.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not think that all of those organizations are in favor of segregation or anything of that kind.

Mr. BROOKE. Did representatives of these agencies appear before the committee when the committee held hearings?

Mr. DOMINICK. No; but they appeared before the Subcommittee on Education. This is part of the problem. At that time I asked them these questions in the process of those hearings. I do not want to give the impression that they have analyzed my amendment which is now pending. They are in favor of the concept.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have to take issue with the statement of the Senator from Colorado. On September 25, 1967, I inserted in the Record a telegram sent to me on September 22 of this year signed by John M. Lumley, the director of the National Education Association, Division of Federal Regulations, in which he said:

NEA DIVISION OF
FEDERAL REGULATIONS,

Washington, D.C., September 22, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Education Association urges passage of S. 2388 as approved by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, to continue operation of economic opportunity programs and to establish the Emergency Employment Act.

JOHN M. LUMLEY,
Director.

I take that as an endorsement by the qualified officer of the National Education Association of the provision in the pending bill which would leave Headstart in the Office of Economic Opportunity as it is at the present time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 22, 1967, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] said:

This is the strong lobbying position of the National Education Association and the teacher unions. There is an enormous vested interest in this country trying to get the Headstart program away from the OEO and to have it placed in the school boards. I have great respect for the National Education Association. I have quite a lot of respect for the various teacher unions. But we must recognize it for what it is; namely, a lobbying effort.

Mr. CLARK. I made that statement on the floor and then, when I went back to my office, I found that I was wrong because there was this telegram from Mr. Lumley.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a final question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Is not the Office of Education obliged by law to deal only with

State educational agencies and public school systems?

Mr. DOMINICK. It depends upon what authority is given to the Office of Education. In this particular amendment, we ask them to approve the State plans as formulated by the State boards and then we give them discretion of 10 percent of the amount of funding, and to take such action as they deem necessary wherever it may be, and whatever the criteria may be.

Mr. BROOKE. Then is only 10 percent to be used for agencies outside the State educational systems and the public school systems?

Mr. DOMINICK. No; to use the total amount for the next fiscal year—\$350 million. No, sir; that is not correct.

Mr. BROOKE. Would the Senator clarify it?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would be happy to do so. The amount of money authorized for 1969 and 1970 is \$350 million in 1 year and \$400 million the next year, allocated to the States under the formula now in the poverty program. We reserve a certain amount of that total of 10 percent for the Commissioner of Education to use in any way he deems necessary. The State plans can provide not only for Headstart programs operating under the public school system but also for community action boards and, by contracts, through community action boards, so that there will be tremendous flexibility. The only thing we are asking is that the plan as such in each State be approved by the State board. If it is not approved, then the Commissioner must go out on his own.

Mr. BROOKE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I want to complete my argument in opposition to the amendment.

The able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has made so effective an argument in opposition to the amendment that it will not be necessary for me to do more than summarize quickly the reasons why, as Senator in charge of the bill, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

I had given three major reasons when I was interrupted by, I think, the useful colloquy with the Senator from Colorado and others.

My fourth reason is that the Headstart programs are presently operated primarily by the community action agencies directly, or their delegates.

It is difficult to compare Headstart programs run by CAA's with those operated by schools but OEO's experience has found that school systems have had difficulties in meeting Headstart's requirements that: parents be involved; comprehensive services be provided outside the classroom; and the program be focused on disadvantaged children.

I think that this is an excellent reason for leaving well enough alone.

My fifth reason is—as I have already stated—the Office of Education does not want it. At this time, it should not be asked to administer a Headstart program. I am pretty skeptical, frankly, about turning a program over to Harold Howe of the Office of Education, for whom I personally have great respect

but who, let us face it, is a pretty controversial figure in many parts of the country at this time.

My sixth reason is that although both the EOA and the ESEA authorize preschool programs, these programs differ in several important respects: title I—ESEA—programs are generally less comprehensive than Headstart; considerably fewer children have been served annually under title I than under Headstart; most title I preschool programs have been operated during the summer whereas Headstart operates both summer and full-year programs; and title I programs serve a substantially greater proportion of children from families whose income is above the OEO eligibility levels. Headstart and title I programs are, however, coordinated through a required checkpoint procedure authorized under the ESEA.

I think perhaps the best argument which has been made in opposition to the amendment was that made by the Senator from Massachusetts when he said, "Why do we want to change a program that is working well? Why change it?"

I have listened with great interest to the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from California. I have heard no sound reason why we want to complicate and confuse an administrative situation which is working well now, and to transfer a program to an agency that does not want it. We know from the hearings of the subcommittee that it will cause infinite difficulties in a number of States and, if we throw it into the educational system, it will destroy Headstart's flexibility.

Mr. President, I am now prepared to yield the floor and vote, if my friend from Colorado is about ready.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am prepared to yield, in about 3 minutes. I want to make a summary. Since I am the proposer of the amendment, I presume I should get an opportunity to say the last word on a couple of points.

The fact that we have problems with coordination between the school system and Headstart is very apparent. Strong evidence is the fact that in the new poverty bill we have had to put in a Follow Through program, which is represented as a means to bridge the gap. The so-called Follow Through program provides \$120 million and may well interject the poverty program into our school systems. It is my hope that by transferring Headstart over to the Office of Education we will eliminate this need, as of next year, when the proposal would start. Thus, we would be able to see if we have corrected the problems by moving the program. It strikes me that with the groups we have supporting this transfer in principle, at least, we should use this opportunity to take the program and put it into an office which has jurisdiction and expertise on the subject. We would then be able to move forward with a coordinated program which will cut down the overall expense and increase the op-

portunity and the scope of a very useful program.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as a cosponsor I want to add my support to amendment No. 342 which would transfer the Headstart program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the fiscal year 1969. The amendment is supported by educational leaders throughout Arizona and the Nation.

There can be little question that the Headstart program has been a successful innovation in education. It has given countless thousands of children the opportunity for a preschool educational experience which, in many cases, compensates for deficiencies which would affect their ability to learn, not only in the first grade but throughout their entire school experience. I am confident, however, that the Headstart program can be made even more successful if we make this administrative change. It seems to me, as it does to most educational leaders with whom I have spoken, to make good sense to coordinate all educational programs into the one agency of Government Congress established for that purpose.

While I have no quarrel with the OEO officials who have operated Headstart, and for the most part they have done an able job, it seems to me that they have enough to do in other poverty programs to keep them amply busy.

There is little doubt in my mind that the Headstart program will be greatly expanded in years to come. Therefore, now is an opportune time to transfer the administrative duties to the Office of Education, which is staffed with the professional educators who can best guide the program's operation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, each year almost 1 million children of poverty enter school for the first time. These children usually bring with them, not a new dress or shirt pocket full of crayons, but a lack of self-confidence, a built-in mistrust of adults—in short, a fear of the whole experience.

In order to combat this deprivation, the office of Economic Opportunity instituted what we now know as the Headstart program, designed to be the first vital step toward breaking the cycle of poverty.

In his message on America's children and youth, delivered on February 8 of this year, the President said of the program:

Headstart has passed its first trials with flying colors. Tested in practice the past two years, it has proven worthy of its promise.

Now, there now are those, Mr. President, who advocate transferring the Headstart program from OEO to the Office of Education. Their primary argument has been that the local program should be run exclusively by the local school systems.

This reasoning is both impractical and illogical. Many school systems are unwilling or unable to run Headstart programs. For the program is not solely concerned with education: There are medi-

cal, dental, and nutritional aspects—to name but a few—which school systems simply are not prepared to handle. This past year, a full 60 percent of the year-long programs were run by organizations other than school systems.

Also, parents play a vital role in developing local Headstart policies and programs. The result is that parents begin to take a more active role in the educational development of their children. As the National Education Association has testified, many school systems are simply not ready to work with parents on anything resembling this basis.

In addition, some school systems cannot by law, and others will not, establish early childhood development programs. Thus a transfer of Headstart to the Office of Education could well mean the end of many local preschool programs.

Finally, Mr. President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, has said that his office is not prepared at this time to assume the functions of the Headstart program.

Because it is vital that the program be continued and expanded; because the progress that has been made these past 2 years must not now be jeopardized; and because the Office of Economic Opportunity which initiated Headstart is best qualified to continue its direction, we must not disrupt the program by pointlessly transferring it to the Office of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 269 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Allott	Ellender	Monroney
Baker	Ervin	Morton
Bennett	Fannin	Mundt
Boggs	Fong	Murphy
Byrd, Va.	Griffin	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hansen	Scott
Carlson	Hartke	Smith
Cooper	Holland	Thurmond
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Tower
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Miller	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Hatfield	Mondale
Anderson	Hayden	Montoya
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Bayh	Hollings	Muskie
Bible	Inouye	Nelson
Brewster	Jackson	Pell
Brooke	Javits	Percy
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Case	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Church	Magnuson	Sparkman
Clark	Mansfield	Spong
Dodd	McCarthy	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Talmadge
Gore	McGee	Tydings
Gruening	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Harris	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hart	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Fulbright	Lausche	Russell
Hickenlooper	Morse	Smathers
Hruska	Pastore	Symington
Kuchel	Pearson	

So Mr. DOMINICK's amendments were rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EVINS of Tennessee Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. MARSH, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. JONAS, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Delaware withhold his request for a quorum call?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as far as the floor manager of the bill is concerned, he is ready for a third reading.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 347 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read, as follows:

On page 7 strike all after the period in line 20 and all of lines 21 through 25, of lines 1 and 2 on page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "In the case of an individual with a history of serious and violent behavior, or a history of repetitive or serious law violation or delinquent acts, such determination must be supported by a signed statement from the individual's local Federal or State district attorney, sheriff, or chief of police certifying that the individual, if selected, is likely to participate successfully in the program and is unlikely to engage in activities or behavior that would impede other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I note that the manager of the bill is temporarily absent from the floor. In deference to him, I think I should save the discussion of my amendment until he returns.

Mr. President, I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in the course of this year, the Senator from Pennsylvania has performed a task seldom undertaken in connection with congressional consideration of legislation to renew a Federal program. With his constructive energy and flair, his usual creativity and deep commitment, Senator CLARK has conducted an examination of the war on poverty that was both just and judicious, exhaustive and, I might say, a bit exhausting. In the course of the last 8 months, the Senator has crisscrossed the country, hearing hundreds of witnesses, seeing and talking with thousands of the poor, and examining dozens of local programs.

As a member of the subcommittee, it was my privilege to join Senator CLARK on a number of his field trips—to Missis-

issippi, to California, to Chicago, to Boston, to New York City, and to homes and programs just a few blocks from where we stand. What struck me as we visited around the country was that if other Senators—whatever their committee assignment, whatever their party, whatever section of the country they are from—had a chance to make the same kind of exhaustive investigation that Senator CLARK has chaired, there would be no opposition to the continuation of the Economic Opportunity Act and, though there might be differences of opinion on the way in which the program should be administered, there would be no disagreement that the present level of funding, and even that proposed by the committee, is grossly inadequate.

For, as one travels around the country to examine conditions of poverty and to investigate our efforts to deal with it, a national picture comes into focus, a picture which transcends one's view of poverty in his own State. We all know there is no area of our country which is totally affluent, which does not contain poverty. But I am convinced that only the exhaustive national survey which the subcommittee undertook gives one a deep, intuitive sense of the extent of the problem and the need to act. From Negro cotton choppers in Mississippi to jobless Negro teenagers in Hough, from people of Spanish surnames in isolated northern New Mexico to Mexican Americans in East Los Angeles, from former coal miners in West Virginia to Appalachian whites who have migrated to Chicago, from Sioux Indians on their reservations in South Dakota to the Indian community in Minneapolis, from Eskimos in Alaska to Puerto Ricans in East Harlem—all over the Nation there are people in extreme poverty—men and women and children without jobs and without hope, without decent housing and without enough to eat.

I believe the experience of an investigation such as we made gives one a special sense of the magnitude of the problem and the urgency of action.

But, everywhere we went we also saw the impact of the war on poverty—Headstart programs, opening new worlds to small children and their parents, Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps programs giving new hope to young men and young women, neighborhood legal services and neighborhood health centers, providing legal protection and medical care to people for the first time.

Our study gave us a firsthand sense of what the war on poverty is, of what its possibilities are, of what it is accomplishing, of what it could accomplish if we were to give it the funds and the resources to fulfill its potential. For if there were desperate, frustrated poor people in every community we visited, there were hopeful, helpful programs as well.

In Mississippi we saw pathetically hungry children and families which had literally no cash income because the revolution in farm technology had deprived them of what little work they had. But we also saw children in Headstart centers, grown men learning to read for the first time, young men and women learning job skills, families receiving Federal food aid.

In California we saw migrant workers living in upturned cars on riverbanks, but we also saw migrant housing and education program which bring more promise to those workers than they have ever had before.

Here in Washington we saw housing within sight of the Nation's Capitol that strained belief. But we also heard what the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps have done for some of the young men and women who live here in the District.

Whatever the program—Headstart, Upward Bound, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps, neighborhood health centers, and so on—the picture is really the same: These programs have made a great difference in the lives of thousands, but there are hundreds of thousands more who have not been reached.

The amount of money authorized in the committee bill is really a bare minimum—a grossly inadequate figure when compared to the scope of the problem. For as the Department of Labor stated flatly in its 1967 manpower report:

Economic and social conditions are getting worse, not better in slum areas.

So we must act. For if we do not, the violence and destruction, the fear and fury which blazed in our cities this summer will continue. But more than that, we must act not just because failure to act will bring further violence, but because we must give some encouragement to those who still believe that progress is possible within our established institutions. We cannot denounce extremists who reject our social system if we do not prove that that system is capable of helping people lead a better life.

The riots which have taken place—and which may all too easily take place in the future—are, of course, an intolerable threat to the essential interests of all of us. A violent few cannot be permitted to threaten the well-being of the many and the hopes of their fellows for progress. Those who lead others to burn and loot must feel the full force of the law.

That, however, is just the beginning, and we should not delude ourselves. The riots are not crises which can be resolved as suddenly as they arose. They are the result of a condition which has been with us for 300 years and will be with us for many years more. We can deal with the crises without dealing with the underlying problem—just as we can give novocaine to a man with a broken arm, without setting that arm in a splint; but the end result will only be more pain, pain beyond temporary relief, and permanent crippling of our society.

And until we deal with the underlying conditions, we are in grave danger: the danger of a deepening division between white and black America, that fear will breed resentment, and resentment hostility, and increasing hostility again feed mounting fear.

This division represents not a failure of compassion, or of the American sense of justice; rather it is a failure of understanding and communication. We live in different worlds and gaze out over a different landscape. Through the eyes of the white majority, the man of decent

impulse and moral purpose, the Negro world is one of steady and continuous progress. In a few years, he has seen the entire structure of discriminatory legislation torn down. He has heard Presidents become spokesmen for racial justice, while Negro Americans enter the Cabinet and the Supreme Court. The white American has paid taxes for poverty and education programs, and watched his children risk their lives to register voters in Alabama. Seeing this, he asks, what cause can there be for violent insurrection, or dissatisfaction with present progress?

But if we try to look through the eyes of the young slum dweller—the Negro, and the Puerto Rican, and the Mexican American—the world is a dark and hopeless place indeed.

The chances are that this young man was born into a family without a father—often as a result of welfare laws which require a broken home as a condition of help. His chance of dying in the first year of life is twice that of children born outside the slum, and inadequate prenatal care also assures that if he survives, his chances of being mentally retarded are seven times the community average.

He begins to grow, often crowded with adults into one or two rooms, without adequate plumbing or heat, each night trying to defend himself against marauding rats.

He goes to a school which teaches little that helps him in an alien world. The chances are 7 out of 10 that he will not graduate from high school—and even when he does, he has only a 50–50 chance of acquiring the equivalent of an eighth-grade education. At one high school which I have visited a number of times and which is not atypical—located in the wealthiest city, in the wealthiest State, in the wealthiest Nation in the world—25 percent of the freshmen read at fourth-grade level or below; half cannot read above sixth-grade level.

For the rest of his life also there are statistics: prices for the most basic commodities are far higher than in the rest of the city; 43 percent of ghetto housing is substandard and overcrowded; tens of thousands of children are treated for rat bites each year; and of a quarter of a million Puerto Rican schoolchildren in New York City, only 37 went on to college last year.

Worst of all, the people of the ghetto and the barrio live today with an unemployment rate far worse than the rest of the Nation knew during the depth of the great depression. If the unemployment of the depression was a national emergency—and it was—our cities today therefore envelop dozens of even greater emergencies. Unemployment in the poverty districts—among Negroes in Hough, Mexican-Americans in East Los Angeles, Appalachian whites in Chicago, Puerto Ricans in East Harlem, Indians on reservations—in short, among groups of Americans of every race and background—is at least three times the national rate and is rising.

But even this does not measure the full extent of the problem. The Labor Department recently did a special subemployment survey which included people

not in the labor force at all, people working only part time and people working but not earning a substantial wage, which showed that 28.6 percent of the working-age population in Harlem and 33.6 percent in East Harlem fall into these categories.

In other cities the subemployment rate is even worse—as high as 45.3 percent in the slums of New Orleans and 47.4 percent in the barrio of San Antonio.

The Department of Labor's 1967 Manpower Report says flatly:

Slum residents have been bypassed by the national rise in real family income. In South Los Angeles—a predominantly Negro poverty area—median family income rose by only 4 percent between 1959 and 1965 and in East Los Angeles—a heavily Mexican-American low-income area—by only 0.2 percent, despite an average rise of 8 percent in consumer prices for urban families.

In other words, real family income in these two areas of Los Angeles dropped by 4 and 8 percent, respectively—while real family income nationwide was rising by 14 percent. From June 1965 to June 1966, 950,000 new jobs were created for young men, but only 33,000, about 3.7 percent, went to Negroes. A Labor Department spokesman explained that Negro youths “just don't have the connections.”

Nor is the problem confined to urban areas. Just in the Mississippi Delta, which which I visited last April with the subcommittee, there are even now 40,000 to 60,000 people who literally have no cash income. And migrant farmworkers have also been left totally out of the economic mainstream, earning an average of \$1,200 a year from farmwork and \$600 from odd jobs. The conditions under which they live and work, which I have seen as I have visited them around the country, are shocking in the last third of the 20th century. Finally, the poverty on Indian reservations is severe, with unemployment ranging up to 80 percent and men dying at 42 years of age, on the average, which is 25 years below the average for the white man.

Mr. President, I might say that although poverty conditions are as bad as I have described them in this part of the United States, the conditions for the Indians, and Eskimos in Alaska are probably the worst conditions of any group.

These, then, are the problems. They will not be banished with force; and they will not just go away. Thirty million poor people all over our Nation are a reality. The slums are a reality, as are idleness and poverty, lack of education and dilapidated housing. Frustrated expectations and disappointed hopes are realities. Above all, the awareness of injustice and the passion to end it are inescapable realities. No force in the world can wish these facts out of existence. Thus we have only one choice. We can face our difficulties and strive to overcome them, with imagination and dedication and wisdom and love. Or we can turn away—bringing repression, steadily increasing human pain and civil strife, and leaving a problem of far more terrible and threatening proportions to our children.

For history has placed us all, black and white, within a common border and under a common law. All of us, from the

wealthiest and most powerful of men to the weakest and hungriest of children, share one precious possession: the name "American." It is not easy to know what that means. But in part to be an American means to have been an outcast and a stranger, to have come to the exiles' country, and to know that he who denies the outcast and stranger among us, at that moment also denies America.

We have begun to meet our responsibilities. The Office of Economic Opportunity has been an innovative and creative agency. It has stimulated a new partnership with private industry in the Job Corps, in other job training, and in the development of quasi-public housing corporations to use the skill of private industry in slum rehabilitation. OEO's neighborhood health centers are an experiment in new ways of delivering health services which could revolutionize health services not just for the poor but for all of us. The New York Times described Headstart as "the most significant educational advance in the past decade."

But the point about all of this is that it is only a beginning. If 700,000 children participated in Headstart this past year, there are hundreds of thousands more who need its special help. If more than 300,000 people were served by OEO legal services this past year, there are hundreds of thousands more who need legal help. If the neighborhood health centers funded this past year will ultimately serve 675,000 poor people, there are hundreds of thousands more who need decent health care. For there are still over 30 million poor people in our Nation, still over 30 million men, women, and children who have been left behind as our country has reached new plateau after new plateau of affluence.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today is the result of an unusually careful study by the members of the subcommittee and their staffs. I think the subcommittee staff is especially to be commended. The bill makes a number of important changes in the structure and administration of OEO. It provides a panoply of new means to assure a coordination of Office of Economic Opportunity programs with other Federal programs which have an impact on the poor. The Senator from Pennsylvania explained these new means of coordination in articulate detail the other day. It provides a new coordination role for the States, which is based on the observations we made around the country. And it provides for greater local initiative in choosing the particular OEO-financed programs which will be developed and applied in each community. For we heard again and again that the programs which worked best were the ones which people in the community themselves chose and developed themselves, and in which, therefore, they had the greatest stake.

I would mention only four major points regarding the bill today: First, that the level of funding authorized in title I of the bill—that is, in the economic opportunity amendments—not be cut; second, that proposals to spin off component programs not be heeded;

third, that the 2-year authorization for OEO which was adopted by the committee not be rejected; fourth, that title II of the bill—the Emergency Employment Act, not be rejected.

First, the committee did increase the authorized funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity from \$2.06 billion to \$2.258 billion. I believe it would be unfortunate if those additional funds were eliminated. They were added to allow funding for a number of items that the committee felt especially important. One of our major findings as we went across the country was that individual programs have too often been cut back by Washington as more applicants appeared to claim a slice of a pie that has not grown fast enough to accommodate them all. These cutbacks at the local level have been extremely damaging. They cause great bitterness and great frustration. The \$198 million which the committee added would alleviate this problem somewhat, and to cut it would, correspondingly, have a most damaging effect throughout the country. I urge the Senate to reject any such proposal.

I might give an example of the kind of cutback which the committee's action might alleviate, although it will not deal with it completely. This summer we had a job program in the city of New York, and there were comparable ones across the country, encompassing a total of 40,000 jobs. After September there was a cutback to 7,000 jobs, so that all of those who held jobs were turned into the street with no place to go. It is that kind of practice, it seems to me, which stimulates violence and lawlessness, and the dissatisfaction which many people feel about our Government and society.

We have all talked about the hot summers and we are all concerned about what is going to happen next summer. It seems to me that these problems are not going to be confined to the summers. We are going to have the same kind of difficulty 12 months a year if we continue directing these programs in the way we have been over a period of several years. That is the responsibility we must accept in Congress, as well as in the executive branch of Government, and, I might add, at the local community level as well. I do not think by any means this is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. But one way in which we in Congress can exercise our share of the responsibility is to reject any effort to cut back the \$198 million which the committee added.

Second, there is talk that various programs—whether Headstart or Upward Bound or Neighborhood Youth Corps—should be removed entirely from the administration and control of the Office of Economic Opportunity and given to other agencies. Our hearings do not support the spin-off idea. Of over 400 witnesses before the committee, only two advocated the abolition of OEO and the transfer of its functions to other agencies. And the record is replete with the testimony of administration officials—OEO, HEW, Labor, and others—that the present distribution of programs is best and should not be disturbed.

Headstart, for example, is not just an education program. As I said earlier, it

seeks to develop the child in relation to his family and the world around him, and a critical part of this is parental involvement. I think transfer to the Office of Education, with the implied presumption that this would involve about running all Headstart programs through local school systems, could cause the unique flavor of Headstart to be lost.

Similarly, there are proposals to transfer some aspects of the Neighborhood Youth Corps to Labor and others to HEW. This double transfer idea raises obvious coordination problems that do not exist now, and the very fact that two agencies are suggested as transferee implies that neither proposal is really better than the present situation.

Third, I believe the 2-year authorization for the program which the committee adopted is wise. The poverty program has proven itself sufficiently now so that annual re-examination is not required. The consequences of annual re-examination, with all the uncertainty that that causes around the country, are damaging. Competent personnel often cannot be attracted to work in a program which has promise of lasting for only a few months. Participation by the community is carried on in an atmosphere of doubt and mistrust. And the burden on Congress is great as well. We will do both the poor and ourselves a great service if we begin now to give the program the extra year of breathing space which the committee bill provides.

Fourth, and critically important, is title II, the Emergency Employment Act. We have always known, or at least we have said to one another, that employment—useful, productive work—is the most fundamental avenue to solving poverty. Yet our actions have not lived up to our observations, as the figures which I quoted at length earlier indicate.

And the crisis in unemployment is the most critical of our failures—for it is significant far beyond its economic effects. It is both measure and cause of the extent to which the poor man is alienated from the general community. More than segregation in housing and schools, more than differences in attitude of life style, it is unemployment that sets the poor man apart. Unemployment is having nothing to do—which means having nothing to do with the rest of us.

We earn our livings, support our families, purchase the comforts and ease of life with work. More important, to be without it is to be less than a man. To be without use to one's fellow citizens is to be in truth the "invisible man" of whom Ralph Ellison wrote so eloquently.

Unemployment is truly our gravest problem. This judgment has been confirmed by every board and commission, expert and amateur, official and layman, that has examined the problem. The McCone Commission looked at Los Angeles and said that the most serious problem in Watts is unemployment. Kenneth Clark's pioneering study looked at Harlem and said that Harlem's key problem is unemployment. The Urban Coalition looked to all the cities and said that the first problem is unemployment.

Title II of S. 2388 is in direct response to the problem. With the Emergency Employment Act, the Senator from

Pennsylvania has come up with a program that deals directly with the difficulty, a program which will work, a program which will provide 200,000 jobs in very short order.

Providing jobs is the one step that is in everyone's interest, no matter what his political philosophy. Placing people in the position where they can obtain productive employment is the one approach that in the end will produce higher revenues and lower welfare costs; and it means lessened costs of crime and crime prevention as well. It means the use of unused resources and greater prosperity for all.

The provision of jobs will have a direct impact on the cost of welfare. A recent analysis of Federal welfare programs showed that of 7.3 million people receiving federally supported welfare assistance, only 50,000 could work. The analysis was intended to show only that the welfare rolls are not filled with deliberate idlers. Many, however, have taken it as proof that job programs cannot reduce the welfare budgets. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Of the 7.3 million welfare recipients, 850,000 were female heads of families, and 2.6 million were minor children from these same female-headed families. Thus, over 50 percent of the Federal welfare rolls are made up of families whose husbands and fathers have left the house. Every study of poverty and its pathology shows that the vast majority of these husbands and fathers are absent precisely because they are unemployed and unable to support their families, and because leaving their wives and children was the only way to qualify for welfare.

Thus, it is the welfare system itself, in combination with the lack of decent job opportunities, that produces the welfare families who are asserted to be permanent dependents of the Government. But providing real job opportunities—for the absent fathers and husbands, and for the fathers and husbands of the future—will enable many of these families to reunite, and others to remain together, and thus help to reduce welfare and dependency—and their costs both financial and personal.

As I have said before, I think some of the provisions of the present welfare system are very worthwhile, but there are also other provisions and a philosophy which can be catastrophic for the country. In the city of New York, welfare costs \$700 million a year. In the State it costs over \$1 billion a year. And the cost is growing by leaps and bounds. The only way to get away from the costs of welfare is not to punish those on welfare, but to provide jobs so husbands and fathers can stay with their wives and children, pay taxes, and be contributing members of society, and not welfare recipients. But the only way to do that is to provide jobs. Title II, as well as the rest of the poverty program, it seems to me, is an important step in that direction.

And employment is the only true long-run solution; only if the poor achieve productive employment will they be able to support themselves and their families, become active contributing citizens, and not passive objects of action, recipients

of our charity. This does not mean that education, for example, is not critical to future employment and self-sufficiency. Of course it is. But unless we achieve employment, we will never solve the problem. People with economic security can buy or rent their own housing; people with adequate incomes can see that their children are educated; people with jobs can mark out their own relationships with their fellows of whatever color. But without employment, without basic economic security and self-sufficiency, any other help we provide will be only temporary in effect.

Title II is a sensible and practical way to begin to meet our responsibilities. Had we enacted it last year or the year before and thereby perhaps headed off the wave of fire and fury which struck this summer, it would already have saved us far more than its cost. But, tragically, all too clearly, it can still save us more than it will cost. And, if we do not enact it, the cost will be more than what we save.

Let me make clear that the kind of stimulus to employment which is contained in title II is not permanent. It is an emergency program growing out of an emergency situation. It may, and hopefully will, lead to new kinds of public service careers, for, as commission after commission, study after study has shown, there is a vast potential for new public service in a wide variety of fields. In the end, the overall employment problem will only be solved by harnessing the great engine of private enterprise to the problem. But at the same time, there are thousands of needed tasks and works in the public sector as well.

For example, there is a growing shortage of skilled and professional help in all of our social service agencies.

In health services, for example, the National League of Nursing estimates a deficit of 344,000 registered nurses by 1970. Current deficit, 125,000. For that same year mental health services predict a deficit of 200,000 employees for State and county hospitals.

In social work, some 15,000 persons are needed yearly to replace those leaving the field and to staff new services. The total number of graduates from schools of social work throughout the Nation is only 3,500 yearly. The HEW Task Force on Social Welfare, Education, and Manpower predicts a need for 100,000 social workers plus 50,000 additional workers for HEW agencies alone by 1970.

In education, the U.S. Department of Labor foresees a deficit of 500,000 elementary and secondary schoolteachers by 1970.

Title II could and would function simultaneously to fill these shortages in the human service fields and to provide on-the-job education and training to the unskilled for effective functioning at entry-level positions and for upward mobility within the agencies hiring them.

And let me make clear that there is ample experience already with the kind of employment that is contemplated by title II.

There are now, for example, 116,000 teachers aides in the United States, most hired with funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The National Education Association has allocated funds to establish a national organization of teacher aides affiliated to the NEA, and plans a national teacher aides conference for the next school year.

The Bank Street College of Education recently made a nationwide study of teacher aides, teacher assistants, family workers and other auxiliary educational personnel employed from California to Puerto Rico. It found "great possibilities in the professional-nonprofessional team in enabling the teacher 'to meet individual needs of pupils.'" The multilevel approach was found to provide "an escape from rigid structuring in the classroom with more small groupings and independent activities possible." The report says that any classroom can benefit from "effective utilization of auxiliaries, regardless of the composition of the school population or the socio-economic background of the auxiliaries."

Oakland, Calif. has created a "ladder of skills" for its teacher aides, in line with the "job first, diplomas later" concept of new careers. A person who first goes to work as a teacher aide can rise through an apprenticeship program to assistant teacher, then to associate teacher—with an Associate of Arts degree, combining work experience with college courses—and finally to certified teacher.

Last June the Women's Talent Corps completed its first training program. A group of women, 23 to 54 years of age, many of whom had previously been on relief, were graduated "from hard-core poverty into expanding futures," according to the New York Times. They will fill subprofessional positions as teacher assistants and guidance assistants.

In the health and welfare fields there is also useful experience to draw upon.

For example, at the Lincoln Neighborhood Service Center Project of New York, six subprofessional mental health aides served more than 25,000 people. The total salary for the six aides was \$25,000. Cost of training, operation of the storefront center was an additional \$25,000. Thus, the center was able to provide vital service to 25,000 persons by spending only \$2 for each individual receiving aid. This is for a 1-year period.

Besides providing direct services for the clients of the center, the aides also organized a number of neighborhood meetings, committees, parties, and special programs. In this way another 20 to 25 percent of the neighborhood, beyond those who received direct service, were benefited by these other types of activities.

And there has been other interesting experience in working with unemployed youth.

Dramatic success was achieved by the Howard University community apprentice program when it motivated and trained a group of "hard-core" disadvantaged young men to become research, preschool, and recreation aides. They all bore the scars of poverty: delinquency records, functional illiteracy, broken homes, fragmented schooling, low measured IQs. As they learned and worked,

they were oriented toward further attainment. They obtained more advanced jobs, returned to school, ceased delinquent behavior, went on to college, and have had significant jumps in their measured IQs.

The homework helpers program started by Mobilization for Youth produced striking benefits for both the teenage tutors and their pupils. The youths hired by the agency to tutor slow-reader grade school students significantly raised the reading levels of their pupils but also vastly improved their own abilities, picking up an average of 3½ years in reading skill.

Finally, the Community Action programs already employ 130,000 nonprofessionals. Research by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., on a sample of 5,000 of these workers in nine cities indicated that these workers have been doing a very effective job, and that they display high morale and considerable involvement in their work, and have been well accepted by professionals.

The Emergency Employment Act is therefore, a well-conceived and practical program. There is ample evidence that there is a potential of far more than 200,000 useful, productive jobs which could be created now in the fields of health, education, police work, recreation, and welfare casework. And there is ample evidence from experience that we already have in employing sub-professional personnel under existing Federal legislation that such a program is practicable and workable. It will help in rural as well as urban areas, and will help create jobs in private enterprise as well as public service.

In summary, then, I urge the Senate to enact S. 2388 as reported. For being killed is more than dying physically. Millions of Americans are dying the slow death of despair and hopelessness. With a gross national product of over \$750 billion, we can surely afford this legislation, which would cost as much as a few weeks of effort in Vietnam. Just this week we voted—by 74 to 3—a military construction bill authorizing over \$2 billion in new barracks and other building. If we can vote \$2 billion for such a purpose without any question, we can surely enact this legislation as the committee reported it.

We cannot just pay lip service to our ideals. We must enact S. 2388 in its entirety now.

Mr. President, I think this is desperately needed legislation. I do not think it is perfect, but I think it will be important in giving to those who desperately need help a feeling that there is still hope in our society and Government and give them a sign that we do care, that there is an interest in them.

I think when we vote \$70 billion for the military budget, when we vote \$2.3 billion for military construction, and when he spend days debating this program, and then propose amendments, and even pass them, involving cuts of up to \$2 billion, it is going to be a sign to the poor in our urban or our rural areas, whether they be Indians, or Mexican-Americans, or Appalachia whites, or Negroes, that the Establishment does not care; that we are interested only in our

own feelings, in our own protection, that which causes us and our children protection and comfort; but, as far as those who are deprived and their children are concerned, who will carry this scar and burden for the rest of their lives, and who cannot recover unless we give them that opportunity, it will be a sign that we may make public speeches, but when it comes to taking the kind of steps that will have meaning and make a change in their lives, they must look elsewhere.

I do not see how, Mr. President, we can, then, be so concerned, upset, and disturbed when we see those who are poor become disenchanted with our society. It is hard for me to believe that we need another study, another committee or commission, or whatever it might be, to investigate what the problems are. We know that the problems exist. We know that people do not have jobs; and when they do not have jobs, they are upset, just as would be all of us in the U.S. Senate were we suddenly to find ourselves unemployed.

Without employment, one cannot support his family. If you had to leave your wife and children because you could not find a job in your neighborhood, particularly if you were unskilled and untrained because of faults in our educational system, you, too, would be upset.

The poor, through no fault of their own, are unskilled and uneducated. Through no fault of their own, there are absolutely no jobs for them. Through no fault of their own, they are forced to bring their children up in houses and tenements filled with rats. Through no fault of their own, they have little hope for the future.

What have we done for them, Mr. President, here in the U.S. Senate? We talk about the war, and about the protection of our own security. That is all worthwhile enough. We talk about the fact that we need an antiballistic missile screen. Such concerns are understandable. To want to save the physical lives of the population of this country is, of course, an important objective.

But as I have pointed out, death can be more than physical destruction; and therein, too, we have a responsibility. For if a person is so lacking in education and so lacking in training that he cannot even hold a job or there are no jobs available for him, his situation is not far from living death.

Here we have a chance, it seems to me, to deal with the problem of poverty, not in a major way, but at least to do something about it in a minor way. If we fail to meet that challenge, it seems to me we are not meeting our responsibility to this body, to our constituents, nor to our country.

Mr. President, we are responsible for handing over to the next generation of Americans, with all that that implies, their country. Will it be a country filled with difficulties, problems, and bitter hopelessness? I hope not.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] not only for his support of the committee bill, S. 2388, but particularly for his kind comments about me and about the study which the Subcommittee

on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty has been undertaking these past 6 months.

As much as any Member of the Senate, but with a particularly keen sense of awareness and compassion, Senator KENNEDY recognizes the serious problems which confront our Nation when tens of millions of our citizens are living in poverty.

I am especially grateful for the fact that the junior Senator from New York participated with me in most of the field hearings and field inspection trips in 13 communities around the country.

Following our field hearings and our hearings here in Washington the junior Senator from New York was extremely helpful in the drafting of the legislation which is now pending before the Senate. Many of the changes which the committee has made in existing law which resulted from our study and field inspections were proposed by the Senator from New York. For example, in order to make more specific the provisions of S. 2388 requiring evaluation of programs, Senator KENNEDY suggested and the bill contains a provision to assure that the opinions of program participants are considered as part of the evaluation.

At Senator KENNEDY's suggestion the concept that financial assistance be channeled through a local community prime sponsor was made more flexible so as to encourage OEO to fund neighborhood-based groups directly when such funding would better serve the purposes of the program. Provisions were also adopted at Senator KENNEDY's suggestion to encourage the prime sponsor to delegate the operation of program components to neighborhood based groups.

Changes were made at the Senator's request, in the language authorizing the legal services program, to assure greater flexibility in providing constructive legal assistance to the poor.

The special impact program authority which Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS coauthored last year was, at the initiative of Senator KENNEDY, revised to assure that the programs funded would be large enough and involve the kinds of activities so as to be capable of having a special impact on communities where they are adopted.

It was also Senator KENNEDY's proposal which resulted in the revision of the welfare assistance provisions of the act in order to achieve more equitable arrangements for welfare recipients and to enable poverty program participants to retain a more realistic portion of their public assistance.

Senator KENNEDY was the author of S. 1789, which authorizes VISTA and the Teacher Corps to work with prisoners and parolees in offering them greater educational opportunity. That legislation was closely related to the bill now before the Senate, and language was adopted to incorporate the substance of that bill in S. 2388.

Finally, and most important, the junior Senator from New York is in fact the coauthor of title II of S. 2388, the Emergency Employment Act. His assistance in working out the provisions

of the emergency employment program was of great value to me and to the other cosponsors of this program.

Again I thank the junior Senator from New York for all his help and support in connection with this legislation.

PROPOSED SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER IAN SMITH, OF RHODESIA, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Post reported today that Prime Minister Ian Smith, of Rhodesia, would need a British passport in order to secure a U.S. visa so that he could fulfill a speaking engagement at the University of Virginia. It is the facts behind this report that I shall speak about today.

Mr. Rosewell Page, Jr., president of the University of Virginia legal forum, invited Ian Smith to address his group because Prime Minister Smith had not been afforded a forum in this country.

Has the time arrived in this country when we are afraid to permit people to speak, even in an academic forum, if we know they have opinions differing from those of our Government? That time must never come. The very essence of the first amendment to the Constitution is that Americans have the right to hear conflicting opinions. Nothing shall interfere with wide open debate on public affairs and international affairs. The one thing, above all others, that has set us up as a country to be emulated is the fact that an individual or group can speak out strongly in opposition to a policy of our Government.

Prime Minister Ian Smith is singularly qualified to speak on the complex question of Rhodesian independence and no redtape or semantic gimmicks set up by the State Department should be permitted to confuse the basic issue.

The United States has declared economic sanctions against Rhodesia, a nation at peace; its crime, if it be a crime, is that it seeks independence from Great Britain—just as did the United States 191 years ago.

Rhodesia is not at war with the United States, such as is North Vietnam—against which country we have not sought economic sanctions.

Should Prime Minister Ian Smith have an opportunity to present Rhodesia's case to the American people?

I feel, Mr. President, that Prime Minister Ian Smith should be heard.

If our Government's reasons for its present policy toward Rhodesia are sound, then the American people will know both sides and will be in a better position to support their government. Many Americans are not now convinced that our Government's attitude toward Rhodesia is either wise or sound.

Let me say, in closing, that I do not know of a more appropriate forum for Prime Minister Ian Smith to discuss the independence of his country from Great Britain than at the University of Virginia, which was founded by Thomas Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence.

Again, I express my appreciation to the Senator from New York for permitting me to make these remarks at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, may I make a comment on the remarks just made by the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I would be very happy to hear them.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would hope, also, that Prime Minister Ian Smith would be permitted to come to the United States, and I hope that arrangements for him to do so will be worked out.

I understand that the problem concerns a British passport but I would hope that, somehow, it would be arranged so that Prime Minister Ian Smith will be able to come to this country and go to the University of Virginia to speak.

As I am sure the Senator from Virginia knows, I went to law school there. We listened to representatives who had different points of view. They spoke both at the law school and at the college.

I think it is extremely important in all universities and colleges in this country that the students hear different points of view, whether they agree or disagree with them.

While I disagree with the Senator from Virginia, I happen to support our Government's policy so far as Rhodesia is concerned. I also happen to feel that Prime Minister Ian Smith has performed a disservice for the people of Rhodesia. However, I think it is elementary in this country that those who have a different point of view from ours, as well as those who have a point of view which might be more in accordance with our own, should be permitted to speak, and that debate and discussion should take place.

As the Senator from Virginia has stated, there is no place more appropriate than a university campus and no university more appropriate than the University of Virginia to invite Prime Minister Ian Smith to speak to them.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from New York, who disagrees with me on the matter of Rhodesia, does agree thoroughly that the Prime Minister should have the opportunity to present his point of view. It is appropriate that he should come to the University of Virginia.

It is well to point out that the Senator from New York is one of the most distinguished of all the very distinguished men and women who have graduated from the University of Virginia Law School.

I am very happy that he joins me—even though we are in disagreement on the general issue here—in expressing the hope that our Government will find appropriate means to permit Prime Minister Ian Smith to come to the United States to explain to the American people his position, although it is a position contrary to that taken by our Government.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ANTIDUMPING CODE—AN EXAMPLE OF EXECUTIVE "REPEAL" OF STANDING LAW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on July 25, 1967, I sent my congressional colleagues a letter detailing my concern with the Antidumping Code signed in Geneva on June 30, 1967. This code clearly is an attempt to amend and emasculate an act of Congress by Executive fiat.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] responded to my letter on the Senate floor on August 23. At that time, I promised a detailed reply to his remarks. The senior Senator from New York expressed his view as to the reasonableness and fairness of the legal standards adopted by the Antidumping Code. But the first issue to be dealt with—an issue of fundamental importance—is not what the legal standards should be, but rather who, under our constitutional form of government, is responsible for determining that standard. In enacting a given standard of the Antidumping Act of 1921 into law, Congress has spoken. At the very least, Congress should have a say in any substantive amendment of that act. No employee in the executive department can be permitted to alter the will of Congress expressed in law. No single Senator's view as to the reasonableness of a particular amendment can purify and make legal an illegal effort to achieve such an amendment of a congressional statute by executive "legislation."

Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] concedes that there is basis for a "very serious difference of view on this important matter." But he would have Congress defer to the courts for its resolution. The senior Senator from Indiana respectfully suggests to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that there is no provision for an appeal to the courts by a domestic industry on this issue. There is no provision in the present Antidumping Act that permits a domestic industry or complainant to appeal to the U.S. Court of Customs the crucial issues involved here—injury and industry determinations under the act. This is a defect in the present act, I might add, which my own antidumping bill, S. 1726, would remedy. Furthermore, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia recently held in *Northern American Cement Corp. v. Anderson*, 284 F. 2d 591 (D.C. Cir. 1960), that the Court of Customs has exclusive jurisdiction over all antidumping matters. Surely the importer who benefits by the emasculation of the 1921 act—who, indeed, is invited by the code to dump his goods in the United States with complete license—cannot be relied upon to test the validity

Sept 28, 1967

13. RYUKYU ISLANDS. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4903, to amend the act providing for economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands (H. Rept. 723). p. H12743
14. FLOOD INSURANCE. A subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 11197, amended, to authorize a national flood insurance program. p. D865
15. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. The conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 11722, the military construction bill, which includes a provision on reimbursement of CCC for military housing. p. D866

SENATE

16. POVERTY. Continued debate on S. 2388, the poverty bill. Agreed to a modified Miller amendment regarding selection of Job Corps enrollees in the case of individuals with a history of serious or violent behavior or a history of repeated or serious law violations or delinquencies. Agreed to a Cooper amendment providing that the assignment of VISTA volunteers shall be terminated in any State upon request of the Governor. pp. ~~S13842-3~~, S13848, S13851-61, S13863-4
17. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 11456, the Department of Transportation appropriation bill (S. Rept. 72), and H. R. 11641, the public works appropriation bill (S. Rept. 574). p. S13802
Sen. Hayden gave notice that he will offer an amendment (to the public works appropriation bill) for the Central Arizona reclamation project. pp. S13806-9
18. PERSONNEL. Sen. Carlson inserted articles and correspondence with the Civil Service Commission regarding a "windfall" severance pay for several Federal employees. pp. S13821-5
19. SMALL BUSINESS. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1862, to increase the authorization and make various amendments for the Small Business Administration. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S13827-8
20. FARM LABOR. Sen. Murphy deplored the farm labor shortage and asked Federal assistance. pp. S13828-30
21. WATER QUALITY. Sen. McGee reviewed actions to improve water quality and recommended additional progress on this matter. pp. S13832-3
22. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Gruening spoke in favor of S. 2454, to permit use of foreign carriers in trade between Alaska and Hawaii. pp. S13845-7
23. NOMINATION. Received the nomination of Price Daniel to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. p. S13864
24. SCHOOL LUNCHES. The D. C. Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2012, to amend legislation regarding internal operation of the school lunch program in D. C. p. D864

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

25. CONSUMERS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Sullivan praising President Johnson's leadership in consumer affairs, and inserting his speech before the Consumer Conference. pp. A4827-8
26. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Kleppe inserted his newsletter on his position regarding spending, inflation, and taxes, and other items of interest to this Department. pp. A4829-30
Rep. Rumsfeld inserted Rep. Curtis' article, "Problems of Federal Debt Management." pp. A4844-5
27. AIR POLLUTION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Ronan urging enactment of the proposed Air Quality Act. p. A4833
28. FOOD STAMPS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Sullivan expressing her gratitude for the "successful outcome" of the food stamp legislation, and inserting an editorial commending the program. pp. A4839-40
29. APPROPRIATIONS. Speech in the House by Rep. Ullman explaining why he did not vote to recommit the continuing appropriations measure. pp. A4848-9
30. JOB CORPS. Rep. Roybal inserted an article on the success of the Job Corps. p. A4849

BILLS INTRODUCED

31. TRANSPORTATION. H. R. 13200 by Rep. Matsunaga, H. R. 13201 by Rep. Miller, Calif. and H. R. 13223 by Rep. Morton, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the development of cargo container vessels; to Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.
32. FLOOD INSURANCE. H. R. 13202 by Rep. Miller, Ohio and H. R. 13213 by Rep. Zwach, to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to Banking and Currency Committee.
33. RESEARCH. H. R. 13211 by Rep. Tunney, to create in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Ecological Advisers; to Science and Astronautics Committee.
H. J. Res. 854 by Rep. Garmatz and others, H. J. Res. 855 by Rep. Hall and H. J. Res. 857 by Rep. Mosher and others, to provide for a study of the resources of the ocean floor by the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and to prevent certain premature actions which might adversely affect the interests of the United States in such resources; to Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.
34. TEXTILE IMPORTS. H. R. 13210 by Rep. Stubblefield, H. R. 13214 by Rep. Zwach, H. R. 13224 by Rep. Morton, H. R. 13225 by Rep. Nelsen, to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to Ways and Means Committee.
35. LABELING. H. R. 13219 by Rep. Talcott and H. R. 13220 by Rep. Vigorito, to amend the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act with respect to the labeling of packages of cigarettes and for other purposes; and to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the broadcasting of advertisements for tobacco products during certain periods; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Japan will be the major market for the gas. The nation is now building two specially built tankers in Sweden to haul the energy source.

Honolulu Gas Co. is very interested in the Alaskan product, but again, the problem is transportation.

The Japanese vessels will be the only ones capable of handling the gas, and they're prohibited from calling at Honolulu from Alaska because of the Jones Act.

Alaska's lumber resources have a potential market for Hawaii, too.

Hawaii lumber experts say the present indirect transportation from Alaska would up the cost compared to the lumber Hawaii now gets from California, Oregon and Washington.

Also, the public here would have to be educated on timber that's different from what they've been buying, though not inferior.

One Hawaii seafood wholesaler is already getting 1,000 pounds of live Alaskan crabs each week via Seattle.

With the influx of Hawaii's visitors demanding all the delicacies they're used to back home, the demand for prime Alaskan seafood will increase.

At present because of the time between flights at Seattle, the mortality rate for crabs has been rather high.

Their chance for survival would be made more possible with direct flights to Hawaii from Anchorage.

With all the potential, trade between Alaska and Hawaii won't be ignored.

A possible joint venture between the gas and lumber interests to build barges for direct service between the two points was suggested at the conference.

A more immediate get together possibility is an Hawaiian delegation to Alaska for further talks.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 13, 1967]

ISLE, ALASKA TRADE LEADERS THINKING BIG

King crabs and clams, flown live to Honolulu from Alaska, are already being served in restaurants here.

But this is only a small part of the huge trade between the 49th and 50th States now being planned.

Here are some of the possibilities if moves discussed yesterday by Hawaii and Alaska business leaders come to fruition:

Fresh Hawaiian pineapple and papaya would brighten tables throughout Alaska, while fresh-cut flowers from the Islands would be available every day.

Using techniques and equipment developed in Hawaii, underwater miners would reap a harvest of gold from the sea floor washed there over centuries from Alaskan gold fields.

Honolulu housewives would turn on their gas stoves to cook with natural gas shipped here from Alaska in liquid form and distributed by Honolulu Gas Co.

Hawaii's growing wood-working industry would use Alaskan timber.

Members of a trade mission from Alaska raised these suggestions when they met Honolulu businessmen at the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii.

Led by the governor of Alaska, Walter J. Hickel, the group spent two days here before heading home after a visit to Japan.

The Alaskan delegation impressed on the local representatives of business and government the need for concerted action to gain loopholes in federal shipping regulations, if a number of these trade opportunities are to materialize.

Gov. Hickel, who said Alaska had to deliberately break federal law to bring its plight to the notice of the authorities, said equally strong action is going to be required from Hawaii.

The problem is presented in the Jones Act, which prohibits the movement of U.S. cargo between U.S. ports in foreign ships.

Hickel said the liquefied natural gas, for example, can only be moved in tankers now being built in Sweden.

These foreign carriers will not be able to service Hawaii as the law stands now.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Sept. 13, 1967]

ISLE-ALASKA LINKS URGED

Hawaii and Alaska should join forces immediately to press for an amendment to Federal law to permit transport of their products between the two in foreign ships.

They also should coordinate their efforts to obtain immediate consideration of a direct Hawaii-Alaska air link.

This was the consensus developed here yesterday during a discussion between members of an Alaska trade mission and a dozen leading Hawaii business and government officials.

"If you are going to get the cost of living down and you are going to compete (in trade), you have to get the Jones Act amended," the Hawaii group was told by Gov. Walter J. Hickel of Alaska. "This is a case where you really have to push."

The Jones Act prohibits the transport of goods and materials between any two states in a foreign ship.

To get some relief, Alaska has challenged the Federal law with two deliberate violations of the act.

"I don't think Hawaii is fully aware of what Alaska has done about the Jones Act," commented Paul Joy of Honolulu Gas Co. He suggested that perhaps Hawaii "has been asleep and not taken the necessary action" to obtain the amendments she needs.

Honolulu Gas has been working in recent years to find a way to obtain liquefied natural gas from Alaska at a cost that would be competitive.

It has been pointed out that without a change in the law an American natural resource will provide a great benefit to a foreign country—Japan—while the same benefits are denied an American state which could use them.

Hickel said liquefied natural gas production at a multimillion-dollar plant is expected to start in 1969. It will be carried to Japan in two tankers of 79,000 tons each now under construction in Sweden.

It has been suggested that one of these ships could call in Hawaii at regular intervals—if it weren't for the Jones Act.

Besides the natural gas potential for Hawaii, the State might be able to obtain less expensive supplies of lumber and fertilizer.

While most of the discussion on the transportation problem centered around an amendment to the law, it was suggested by James Read, manager of Ultramar Chemical Co., that the two states should take a look at a possibility of transporting their own materials, possibly via barge:

"I don't think Hawaii is ever going to have any relief from the Jones Act," Read said.

The situation regarding direct air routes is considerably different than shipments by sea.

Both states were rebuffed by the Civil Aeronautics Board in efforts to get the Hawaii-Alaska route decision removed from consideration with the complicated Transpacific Route Case.

We have probably moved without collective effort," said Hickel. "We should go to the CAB and ask them to show justification for not doing it. We should get on this right away, go right to the CAB and proceed to a decision."

Don Dickey, general manager of the Alaska Chamber of Commerce, emphasized that the CAB "won't come calling" to the two states involved. "It will take some head knocking," he said.

Al Harris of the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii staff noted that the proposed Hawaii-Alaska air route "has great potential for growth."

"The potential," said Hickel, "is in what is not happening now. With a little romance, we could sell sea and ski vacations to Europeans and save them at least three hours' flying time to Hawaii."

He said that about 100,000 Europeans are flying across the North Pole via Anchorage, through which five foreign airlines operate. To reach the south Pacific areas, they must continue either to the U.S. Mainland or to Japan.

In some instances, Hickel pointed out, an extra 14 hours of flying time is required to get to Hawaii from Anchorage. As an example he cited Air France, which carries its passengers to Los Angeles before they make the Pacific flight.

Anchorage is a few miles closer to Hawaii than Seattle, but today it is necessary to at least go via that Washington city while traveling between the two Pacific states.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 12, 1967]

RISE IN ISLE-ALASKA TRADE FORECAST

The governor of the State of Alaska, Walter J. Hickel, predicted in Honolulu yesterday that big business will develop between the 49th and 50th states.

A major trade boost will come from sales of Alaska produced liquefied natural gas to Hawaii, he said.

And an Alaska-Hawaii air route would be a logical extension of over-the-pole flights from Europe, creating a "whole new marketing area" for the airlines.

Hickel is in Honolulu as the head of an Alaskan trade mission, now on its way home after a visit to Japan.

The Honolulu Gas Co. has already indicated interest in the possibility of tapping Mainland natural gas resources by shipping the gas here in liquefied form.

LARGEST PLANT

Hickel said Alaska will soon have the largest plant in the world to do the liquefying.

It would take three years to convert the gas facilities here to handle it, but Hickel said the Alaska plant will not be in operation until 1969.

At that time Alaska will begin supplying the gas "in big quantities" to Japan.

A major obstacle in supplying Hawaii is the Jones Act, drawn up to protect U.S. shipping, which prevents foreign carriers from moving cargo between American ports.

He said:

"It will be necessary to get a waiver from the law so that the foreign carriers taking the gas to Japan will be able to service Hawaii, too."

"The Jones Act should not apply to Hawaii and Alaska."

AIR LINK

Hickel described proposals for a direct air link between Alaska and Hawaii as "excellent."

He said:

"Flights land every day at Anchorage after an over-the-pole hop from Europe."

"They should be allowed to fly on to the South Pacific through Hawaii."

"The travel industry would then be able to offer complete sea and ski packages, using Alaskan snows and Hawaiian surf and sunshine."

OPPORTUNITIES

He said the Alaskan group found huge opportunities for trade between Alaska and Japan.

He said:

"Japan has a tremendous interest in the vast natural resources of Alaska."

"There is already more Japanese capital invested in our state than in all the others put together, and we expect this to double within a few years."

"The natural resources of Alaska and the commercial resources of Japan naturally complement each other."

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 548, S. 2388, the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON FOR HIS APPOINTMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITY COUNCIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning at the White House swearing in ceremony of Walter E. Washington as mayor, and Thomas W. Fletcher as deputy mayor of the District of Columbia, President Johnson announced the names of the new nominees for the District of Columbia City Council. These nominees will serve the District of Columbia City Council subject to their confirmation by the Senate.

These outstanding individuals will bring to our city government the kind of wisdom, leadership, and understanding that will provide a meaningful voice for all citizens in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. President, I highly commend President Johnson for the choices he has made.

I have worked on the Senate District of Columbia Committee for a great many

years. I have come to know each one of these nominees. And I stand before the Senate today to vouch for them as dedicated citizens of the Nation's Capital.

This is a great day for our new mayor and for all those who have worked long to create a truly modern and efficient government.

The following nominations have been made by the President: Max Kampelman, Chairman; Mr. Fauntroy, Vice Chairman; Stanley Anderson, Mrs. Margaret Heywood, John Nevius, William Thompson, J. C. Turner, Polly Shackleton, Joseph Yeldell.

Mr. President, my boss really, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, is present in the Chamber. I am sure I bespeak our mutual views when I say that these nominees, once they are confirmed, and the mayor and the deputy mayor, will receive from the Senate District of Columbia Committee its enthusiastic help and support as the city council takes up the very great responsibility that the President has imposed upon it.

The outstanding qualifications of each one of the persons whom the President has nominated for the city council are shown by biographical data which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the President of the United States delivered an elegant statement this morning when he presented Mr. Walter Washington and Mr. Thomas Fletcher to take their oath of office in their capacity as mayor and deputy mayor, respectively, of the District of Columbia, under the new Reorganization Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's remarks on that occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SWEARING IN OF WALTER WASHINGTON, COMMISSIONER, AND THOMAS FLETCHER, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, EAST ROOM, SEPTEMBER 28, 1967

Mr. Justice Fortas, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Washington and family, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Fletcher and family, distinguished Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, Members of the Court, Ladies and Gentlemen:

More than ceremony summons us here to the East Room this morning.

We celebrate a new era for the Capital City as we meet here to swear in Walter Washington as Washington's first Mayor, and Thomas Fletcher as his deputy.

The citizens of the District have waited almost a century for this day to come, and all that it symbolizes.

This is the day—and this is the year—that the District emerges into the world of the 20th Century government.

With the recent reorganization plan, the Nation's Capital was liberated from the outworn practices of past years. That reorganization plan equips the city with new machinery to let its government serve the needs of its people.

But the best machinery can function effectively only in the hands of the best men.

I looked across America to try to find these men. And I think we found them—men with

the strength and the character and the vision to deal with tough problems. Now, this morning, we commit those problems to their capable hands.

No one here, for a moment, minimizes these problems.

The District's new day comes at a time of real crisis for every American city. And Washington, D.C., the Capital City, represents the American city.

It is alive with promise. And more than any other, it houses the heritage of our history.

But beyond the monuments, urban erosion eats at a city's heart and at a city's hope.

The needs are clear to all of us: Safety on the streets and in our homes; driving crime from our midst; health and education for our children; a decent roof over every family; a good job for every person who is willing to take it. Then every resident can share the pride that stirs every visitor to our Capital.

The leaders who will help to solve those problems know the challenge. They are uniquely qualified to act because their careers have been spent in action, in meeting the needs of cities and the needs of their people.

Together, this team has the energy and the experience to deal responsibly with the great urban and human problems of our time. Together, they will focus those talents on our national capital city.

Mr. Fletcher wrote an outstanding and distinguished record as City Manager of San Diego, California. He brings to his task a deep knowledge of how modern city administration and fiscal planning can work to the benefit of the people.

Mr. Washington brings unsurpassed skills as a city executive. He is taking a very large reduction in salary and making sacrifices to come here to accept this draft from his President. He is an authentic leader and he has devoted a lifetime of effective and inspired work in the cause of good housing, one of our most critical urban needs—to say nothing about what he has done for beautification in the District of Columbia. He has lived and worked on the streets of his home city. And he has said that he is going to travel those streets again, in pursuit of the progress that the people want and the people need and the people desire and expect.

Mr. Mayor, your walk will be long and arduous, but I believe it will be rewarding.

You will walk with the eyes of the Nation on you.

Everything you do will be known. You will live in a goldfish bowl as most of us public servants do. But, Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Deputy Mayor, we wish you well—and bid you god-speed.

Mr. Mayor, and Mr. Fletcher, you won't be walking alone. I am sending to the Senate my recommendations for the District of Columbia City Council.

In filling this Council, it was our goal to find among the 800,000 residents of the District of Columbia nine exceptional men and women to work with you, to work on the team, to assist you in leading the government of the Nation's Capital, to represent the people at all times in this new venture in government that we are undertaking.

We have spent weeks in considering recommendations made to us by organizations, in searching and consulting with the best authorities that we could talk to. We have reviewed hundreds of records and files. We have sought and obtained not only your recommendations, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Fletcher, but those of civic, labor, religious and other leading non-political groups.

Today I am happy to announce the names of those that I recommend to serve on the Council. And if the Senate is willing, they will serve on the Council.

As Chairman, a distinguished Washington attorney, a political scientist, a teacher, a wise counsellor, a leader in bringing educational television and modern transportation to the Nation's Capital, Council Chairman Mr. Max Kampelman.

post, which will be of such interest to the whole country.

The appointment of the vice chairman is also of interest to me. The Reverend Walter E. Fauntroy is well known to me, and to many other Senators, as a leader in the struggle to gain recognition for the Negro people, and equal opportunity under the law and under the Constitution. He is a man of distinction, high quality, and great patriotism. He is a distinct credit to this country, as he will be to the District of Columbia.

The President tried to make these appointments bipartisan in nature. I wish to commend him on his choice of those from the Republican side; namely, John A. Nevius, who is not only a member of my party but also one of those identified within my party who believes in the progressive concepts with which I have been associated all my life.

I take great pleasure, too, in commending the appointment of Margaret A. Haywood and William S. Thompson, the other nominees from my party.

I think these appointments are most auspicious and are of a quality with that of Walter E. Washington, who is now the Commissioner, or "Mayor" of the District of Columbia. He is also a New Yorker.

We have every reason for great satisfaction in the announcements made by the President today. This is long overdue recognition of some element of self-government—at least, autonomous local government for the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have an amendment pending at the desk. I have modified the amendment, and I should like to have the amendment read, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7 strike all after the period in line 20 and all of lines 21 through 25, of lines 1 and 2 on page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

In the case of an individual with a history of serious and violent behavior, or a history of repetitive or serious law violation or delinquent acts, such determination must be supported by a signed statement from an official of the individual's community, such as the appropriate prosecuting attorney or his deputy, sheriff or his deputy, chief of

police or his deputy, parole or probation officer, or chief executive officer, certifying that the individual, if selected, is likely to participate successfully in the program and is unlikely to engage in activities or behavior that would impede other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there has been widespread concern and criticism over the inadequate screening of prospective enrollees in the Job Corps. The majority leader of the Senate well expressed the problem on April 28 last year when he said:

It was not my intention to support the establishment of three reformatories in my State.

He went on to describe the criminal activities of a Job Corps enrollee in his State and concluded by saying:

I cannot stress too strongly the need for a more careful selection of Job Corps men.

In the April 18 issue of the Oakland Tribune, an article on the Camp Parks Job Corps states that of the 7,591 young men enrolled since April 26, 1965, only 2,000 completed one or more of the courses; and of these, 1,567 have gone to work, back to school, or into the military service. Only 1,026 actually graduated from the Job Corps. The article reports:

There is violence on the base—knifings, beatings, extortion, frequent thefts, vandalism, drugs, fear, and repeated muggings. . . . The climate of terror that exists has been confirmed during many interviews with Corpsmen, counselors, teachers and even administrators for the Job Corps. . . . the director of community affairs for Camp Parks concedes that girls have been smuggled into some of the dormitories as well as liquor and marijuana.

On March 12 of this year, the Job Corps Director, William P. Kelly, reported that one in 10 of the men enrolled in the Job Corps had been convicted of some serious crime; and 37 percent had some record of misbehavior. It is this group which, in my judgment, has not been properly screened.

There has been recognition of this screening problem; and, in all fairness, I want to say that it has been my observation that under Director Kelly there has been some tightening up. The bill pending before the Senate, particularly the section to which my amendment is offered, attempts to cope with this problem.

Let just a few of these bad apples in, and they will disrupt the entire program and discourage many other enrollees from staying in the program. My best information is that a good many of the dropouts—and the dropout problem has been serious—have been the result of violence and other activities of some of the improperly admitted Job Corps enrollees.

Nearly half the Job Corps enrollees, nationwide, have left or been discharged before completing their course, and most of these left within 3 months after enrollment. The dropout rate in some Job Corps centers has been much higher. Certainly, a better job of screening would have prevented this.

I think it should be understood that these Job Corps centers are operated by private industry under contract with the Federal Government. Naturally, profit is involved, and there should be. But the desire to make a profit should not be such as to cause lax screening of prospective Job Corps enrollees.

Administration would naturally play an important part in discipline at a center. But there is a limit to what sound, tough discipline can do. It can only work with the people screened through to the center, and if screening is lax, discipline will break down.

Another aspect of this problem, quite apart from the Job Corps center and the other Job Corps enrollees is the local community.

An article in the August 10 issue of the Wall Street Journal points out that hostility in communities near Job Corps centers toward these centers has been widespread. Referring to the center at Camp Atterbury, the article points out that troublemakers at the camp had driven out boys who wanted to learn. A new director kicked out 250 of the offenders. This is all to the good, but the question is, Why did not screening keep most of these 250 out in the first place?

All of us have seen articles reporting on problems at Job Corps centers for girls, involving allegations of prostitution, drunkenness, fights, theft, and truancy. Individuals involved in such activities need help—but that help should not be provided by Job Corps centers. Where it has been tried, it has spoiled the program for most of the other enrollees and made for bad relations with local communities.

In today's edition of the New York Times is an article entitled "Antipoverty Office Suspends Coast Project for Rehabilitation of Gang Youths." The article describes a quarter million dollar grant for a demonstration project in California's San Fernando Valley which was announced last August 10, although the money has not yet been released for the project. The idea of the project is to channel gang energies into social services, led by one of the gang's idols. But the proposal has stirred up great controversy in the community and the refusal of police to support it. Apparently the idol who had been selected to lead the gang members in these social services was arrested on a charge of holding up a liquor store, and had a record of 14 previous arrests. War on poverty officials say that the project is not "dead," but merely "suspended."

I recognize that there is a problem with gangs, but it seems to me that in trying to cope with the problem, we must bear in mind two things: First, we should not discourage young people who abide by the law by giving leadership recognition to people who are law violators; and second, we must take into consideration the need to maintain good relations with the local communities where war on poverty projects are located.

As I have said, the pending bill has sought to do something in the case of the potential troublemaker. The amendment I offer seeks to go a little further. I believe that if the types of officials who

are listed in my amendment have to certify, as provided in the amendment, the prospective Job Corps enrollee will probably make a go of it, will probably not cause disciplinary problems or problems in connection with relationships with the local community, and the program will be benefited. If they are not able to certify, if they are not willing to certify, then probably the individual involved should not go to the Job Corps.

It may be that at the particular time an official would not be willing to certify. He might say, "Let's wait a little while and see how this individual gets along for the next 3, 4, or 5 months; and if he performs all right, then I'll certify."

However, as it is now, I do not believe that the pending bill provides an adequate certification. Who is a "professionally qualified person" can mean many things to many people. Moreover, a professionally qualified person in a community may have absolutely no responsibility to the community. An official such as a local prosecuting attorney or his deputy, or the local chief of police or his deputy, or the mayor, or somebody comparable, in an official capacity, has a responsibility to the community. I believe that certification from such an official would be more meaningful.

I wish to make clear that I recognize the problems of obtaining such a certification in certain cases. For example, in a large metropolitan area, such as Chicago, Los Angeles, or New York City, it is pretty difficult for a prospective Job Corps enrollee to obtain a certification from the chief of police or the deputy chief of police. That is the reason why the amendment was worded to point out the types of officials from whom we would require the certification, rather than to make it all-inclusive. That is the reason for the phrase "such as."

I believe that flexible and prudent administration would permit obtaining certification from some other type of official of a relatively high standing in the community, without forcing all applicants possessing a questionable record to obtain a certification from one of the particular officials listed in the amendment.

I wish to make that very clear.

There is another matter that should be made clear and that is that the Job Corps Director would still retain discretion in accepting an applicant. There may be a Job Corps applicant who has obtained such a certification from the local mayor, but that would not tie the hands of the Director. The Director would not have to admit the applicant.

Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the junior Senator from New York and I believe this amendment will be acceptable to him. I have also discussed this matter with other Senators, including members of the committee from my side of the aisle. We have spent quite a bit of time trying to refine the amendment. I hope the Senator will accept the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Iowa that I think the modification of the amendment, as we have worked it out, is acceptable to us and will be accepted by the committee. Prior to that, I might point out that this was a matter

that was taken up within our committee, as the Senator knows. We went into the matter in considerable detail. My colleague from New York, who is now in the Chamber, participated in trying to write some language to protect the Job Corps, but also the individual. We wrote in the language:

Before selecting an individual who has a history of serious and violent behavior against persons or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction or other major behavioral aberrations, the Director shall obtain a finding from a professionally qualified person who knows his individual situation that there is reasonable expectation that the opportunity provided by the Job Corps will help him to overcome his problem.

We felt that dealt with the matter. The Senator from Iowa refined that language to put in:

In the case of an individual with a history of serious and violent behavior, or a history of repetitive or serious law violation or delinquent acts, such determination must be supported by a signed statement from—

Would the Senator clarify what that statement would be in accordance with his modification?

Mr. MILLER. The statement would be a signed certification from an official from the local community. Then, as I pointed out, I used the phrase "such as" to indicate that the intention is not to limit the officials by the language in the bill, but that the language would be broad enough to meet problems that might arise in a large city, such as the city of New York, where it would be difficult to obtain a certification from the chief of police.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I appreciate the fact that the Senator recognizes that individual difficulties might arise in particular communities in this matter. It is possible under certain circumstances that if the Director of the poverty program made a determination that none of the individuals so listed would be appropriate, that in unusual circumstances and special circumstances he might go to some other official; such as the superintendent of education, or an official of the schools.

Mr. MILLER. That is correct. I would add a footnote to what the Senator said. I do not wish to depreciate the effort made by the committee to improve this matter by urging the use of a professionally qualified person, but it would seem to me that prudence would dictate that one of these local officials could contact someone who knows the applicants' individual situation, if he were in doubt. I think prudence would dictate that he contact a professionally qualified person, possibly a local school principal, to find out something about the individual before deciding to certify or not certify.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I might say to the Senator that it is the intent of the Senator from Iowa and the floor manager of the bill that that be done before the certificate is forwarded to the Director of the Job Corps; that the individual is making a study or the finding that other individuals within the community are being contacted who know more about the boy or girl.

Mr. MILLER. I am sure that is our mutual intention in that respect.

I wish to emphasize that we are not talking about the typical Job Corps enrollee, although we are talking about a good segment of the Job Corps enrollees.

The statistics show that in one Job Corps center 37 percent of the enrollees had records of a previous law violation; one out of 10 had a record of a serious law violation. We are talking about this area and probably not all of that 37 percent would be regarded as having repetitive law violations. We are talking about the tough cases. We have to be concerned about the tough cases. If they can make it in a Job Corps center this is all to the good; but if they are going to serve as troublemakers to make it difficult for others to make a go of it we should take precautions to have them screened properly so they do not get in.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator on that point. I believe the Senator made the point that the director of the Job Corps must first make the determination himself that the individual boy or girl falls in this category and thereafter has to make this request from the official in the community.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Then, the second point the Senator made is that even then, if the certificate is given to him, he does not have to accept it. He can accept or reject the boy or girl.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct, but I would suggest this:

While, as the Senator points out, the law leaves the matter up to the discretion of the director as to whether or not an individual falls in the category of violent behavior, repetitive law violation and the like—although this is up to his discretion to make that determination in the first instance, I think it only prudent that he would bend over backwards to be on the safe side, because he should not wish troublemakers getting into the Job Corps who are going to deprive others of the opportunity that the Job Corps offers them.

I can understand that in certain situations discretion might be necessary, in order to avoid local discrimination. However, here again, this is a matter of prudence, and we can be confident that the director will prudently exercise that discretion.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I wish to say, in closing, that the Senator has properly pointed out the high percentage of those who do not finish in the Job Corps. I think that all of us might be concerned about that. We must also remember that a high percentage of these same boys and girls are boys and girls who come from these groups that never finish school. Three out of 10 go through high school and 40 percent drop out. In some areas the percentage is up to 80 percent of the students who get to the eighth grade.

We are dealing with a group which has already had a difficult time. If we are going to condemn the Job Corps—and I am not saying that the Senator meant to condemn the Job Corps; I think they have done a remarkable job under the circumstances—and if we are critical of them we should put it in the context of

realizing that we would be critical of the educational system as a whole and the fact that these boys and girls did not finish school and did not remain in school in order to graduate from school, and because of their background or outlook, they have special problems with which the Job Corps can deal, in many areas, very effectively.

Mr. MILLER. I do not particularly wish to discuss this aspect of the matter because the Senator knows there has been much criticism of the dropout rate. I have been critical of it also. I felt for a long time that this situation could be improved with certain action.

The point I wanted to make in bringing out the statistics is that these are rather serious statistics and that the problem has at least been aggravated and, I think, in substantial part caused by, the troublemakers who have been admitted into the Job Corps centers, and who made it so tough on the other Job Corps trainees that they dropped out. If we can prevent that, we would have a better program; and we can do so by better screening.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 357

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 357, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 110, line 7, before the period, insert the following:

The assignment of such volunteers in any State shall be terminated by the Director when so requested by the Governor of such State not later than thirty days after such request has been made by the Governor to the Director.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered refers to a situation with respect to the assignment of VISTA volunteers and volunteers selected by organizations which are funded by OEO. This matter has been brought to my attention by a situation which has arisen in my own State.

May I have the attention of the manager of the bill?

May I ask who is managing the bill at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I beg the Senator's pardon. Some of our colleagues have been engaging my attention.

Mr. COOPER. I understand.

Amendment No. 357 is fairly simple in its purpose. I believe I can explain it in a few minutes, and I hope the Senator will accept it.

As the Senator knows, the act provides that when volunteers who are selected directly by VISTA—the Director—and assigned to a State, or are proposed to be assigned to a State, they will not be so assigned unless the Governor of the State assents.

That is also the situation, I am informed, with respect to volunteers who have been selected by an organization which is funded by OEO; and in such a situation, if the Governor does not consent, they will not be assigned to the State.

Recently, a problem arose in Kentucky, which I will not discuss in all its aspects, but solely as it relates to this question. There are VISTA volunteers assigned to Kentucky who have been selected by the Director. In addition, there are also volunteers working in Kentucky who were selected by an organization known as the Appalachian Volunteers, which is funded by OEO. Some difficulties arose in Kentucky, and the Governor of the State asked that no additional volunteers, either those selected directly by the director or those selected by the sponsor, Appalachian Volunteers, be assigned to Kentucky.

Because I had received a number of inquiries from my State as to the response of the Director, I requested a meeting with representatives of OEO who were in charge of the VISTA program. They informed me that VISTA would not assign volunteers to a State without the consent of the Governor. Furthermore, they stated that it was their view that the law was not clear as to whether VISTA is required to recall previously assigned volunteers to a State when the Governor requested that they be removed.

It seems to me that the intent is not to assign volunteers to a State unless the Governor agrees. Should a situation arise where their work in the State—at least, in the opinion of the Governor and the people—is found not compatible with the best interests of OEO, then the volunteers should be withdrawn at the Governor's request.

I wish to be factual in what I have to say. I have spoken with officials of OEO about this question and I called a meeting of representatives of VISTA. They manifested no deep opposition to my proposal. They were of the opinion that the present law is not clear. I believe it should be made clear in the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it seems to me that one thing the Senator would not wish to do himself—and the manager of the bill will inform the Senator as to whether it is acceptable, and I shall not speak until then on the subject—would be to tie it down to not later than 30 days in statutory language.

I would suggest that the Senator have it read: "thirty days or at a time thereafter agreed upon by the Governor and Director." Because a situation may arise in which they may not wish to be bound by the 30 days themselves.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that is a good suggestion. I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator modify his amendment to that extent?

Mr. COOPER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. CLARK. If I may have the attention of the Senator from Kentucky for a moment, I believe there is a technical defect in his amendment on line 1, where I believe the phrase should be "after the period" and not "before the period".

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. I modify my amendment by striking the word "before" in line 1 and substituting for it the word "after".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from New York, the ranking minority member of the committee, and it seems to me that it is not objectionable, and I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 113, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Persons serving as volunteers under this section or under section 821 shall provide such information concerning their qualifications as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures, to the extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director requires under Part A of this title. The Director may fix such procedures for the selection and approval of persons who are low income residents of the area to be served by the project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title."

On page 113, line 20, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this amendment has not been printed but it has been stated. I shall explain the amendment briefly.

I have offered this amendment because of a situation which arose in Kentucky regarding the selection of volunteers by the sponsoring organization, Appalachian Volunteers, which is funded by OEO.

I have discussed this matter with representatives of VISTA and I requested an explanation of their procedures in selecting and approving volunteers for VISTA.

I was informed that the procedures followed were substantially the same as those procedures followed by the Civil Service. When reviewing the submitted application forms, which forms are substantially identical to those used by the Civil Service, and where the application reveals circumstances indicating criminal activity, subversive activity, or other forms of misconduct, VISTA then refers the matter to the FBI, for further investigation as is the case of applicants for positions in the Federal Government.

However, with respect to volunteers who are selected by other agencies funded by OEO, there are no similar procedures or requirements. The Appalachian Volunteers have received several million dollars from OEO, but as far as OEO is aware the Appalachian Volunteers has no procedures to screen and select their applications, and the Director of OEO has no control over their selection or approval.

Mr. President, my amendment would provide that the director shall require the same procedures and information of all volunteer applicants as is required of those who are selected to represent VISTA. The same procedures made applicable to all categories of volunteers would assure the selection of persons with proper qualifications and proper character.

I would make one exception. My amendment would exempt volunteers who are selected from low-income residents of the area to be served who do not have the educational qualifications similar to college men and women who apply for VISTA. The Director is authorized to prescribe whatever qualifications he thought appropriate.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. If I understand the Senator correctly, the Senator wishes to make certain that the general character of the volunteer is known and recorded, and that the individual has been screened before he is taken into the program as a volunteer.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. I take this position for two reasons. We want the VISTA programs to be successful. If those volunteers who are selected do not have the necessary qualifications or the necessary background I think that this lack weakens the entire program and invites criticism of the program by the people of the State, and if that happens there is lacking the needed community cooperation to make these programs work.

I shall relate certain events that recently took place in Kentucky. There has been a good deal of news coverage given to the situation.

At one time a man named McSurley and his wife were employed by VISTA or OEO in Washington and were let out. They immediately attached themselves to the Appalachian Volunteers, which has headquarters in Bristol, Tenn. For

a time they were in the Appalachian Volunteers organization.

After a while, word was received—I suppose from VISTA—that they had been let out in Washington. The charge was made in Kentucky that they had been disseminating literature throughout eastern Kentucky in which they called for, in substance, the overthrow of the Government, the local government, the State government, and the Federal Government. As a result, they were arrested and tried, and under the holdings of our courts they were released.

I do not particularly wish to address myself to these particular individuals or what took place there. I believe my amendment would assure that qualified people are appointed and would insure that the situation which has taken place, bringing widespread criticism on OEO, VISTA, and the volunteers, would not arise again.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Would the Senator agree with the Senator from California that it might be a good idea if in the rules and regulations selecting these people from now on the OEO and the other Government agencies might be restricted from employing people who are calling for the overthrow of this Government and who expect the taxpayers of this country to pay for their own destruction at the same time? Would the Senator think this might be a good regulation for the Director to promulgate in running the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mr. COOPER. I agree. In my discussions with OEO they said it was already their practice. They did not want to employ anyone who advocated the overthrow of the Government. This amendment would give us a test of the applicant's qualifications. It would not prevent anyone from being employed because he had expressed his views on a subject. It would provide for necessary screening procedures. I think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What is the number of the amendment the Senator has called up?

Mr. COOPER. I had stated that the amendment was not printed, but that I have given the Senator from Pennsylvania a copy of it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have had an opportunity to consider the amendment and to discuss it with the Senator from Kentucky. I think it is unobjectionable. I am confident that it would meet with the approval of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Therefore, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 359.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with but that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Amendment No. 359 is as follows:

On page 48, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 4, page 49, and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall be established and maintained so as to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program, as developed and implemented, is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall include the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person designated by such official and other appropriate public officials or their representatives, and representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

"(b) At least one-third of the membership of the board shall be persons who are selected by residents of the areas and members of the groups served. Each community action agency shall establish procedures by which appropriate representation is provided (1) to poor persons living in neighborhoods where poverty is concentrated, and (2) to other poor persons including the elderly and rural residents living outside these neighborhoods. All members of the governing board selected to represent specific geographic areas must reside in the area they represent.

"(c) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which community agencies and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented on the governing board may petition for adequate representation."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I think I can explain the amendment briefly to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the chairman of the subcommittee and manager of the bill. We had a debate about it on the floor of the Senate yesterday. I had a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and a short colloquy with the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, at the time of the adoption of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA].

My amendment would restore to the bill the language which was recommended by the administration. That language, essentially, is on page 2 of the bill. It would require the governing board of the community action program to include among its members the chief elected official or officials of the community.

I gave my reasons yesterday why I believe this should be the rule and should be mandatory. I believe that if community action programs are to be successful the support of all the community

is necessary, not only its private citizens and organizations, but the governing officials of the community, as well. Further, it is necessary to mobilize local resources, including funds, and, we would hope, the abilities and capacities of the community's officials. Those persons have been elected by the people. They enjoy, at least for as long as they are in office, the support of the people. I think it is necessary that the local governments be involved in these community programs. The job of striving for the elimination of poverty will require much more than the resources of the Federal Government. It will require the help of State and local governments as well as the great body of private citizens.

The administration in its recommendations, itself recognizes the need for the mandatory inclusion of local officials. I think their inclusion should be mandatory.

Yesterday, the Senator from New York stated that he felt that if elected officials were on the board their presence might cause some members of the board to be less diligent in presenting their views.

I do not think so, because they present their views very strongly and firmly to elected officials.

Second, it may be thought that in smaller States where there are other problems, such as integration, the addition of a local official might not be helpful. But, as the Senator knows, another section of the bill provides procedures which will enable the director, even though a project has been vetoed, upon review, if he thinks the veto should be overruled, to initiate and support the program.

That expresses my viewpoint, Mr. President, and I hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment and take it to conference so that there can be further discussion of this problem.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no objection to the first sentence in subparagraph (a) of the pending amendment; nor do I have any objection to subsection (b) or subsection (c).

However, I regret that I cannot accept the second sentence in subsection (a) which reads as follows:

Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall include the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person designated by such official and other appropriate public officials or their representatives, and representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

The principal difficulty I have is with the use of the word "shall" on line 1 on page 2 of the amendment. The committee gave this matter very careful consideration. It thought the administration was wrong in requiring that elected public officials must serve on community action boards. This is largely because of such a wide variety of local experience which has been built up over the 2½ years since the Act came into being. A majority of the committee thought—as a matter of fact, this included most of

the minority members—that it was a mistake to put these boards in a strait-jacket and require that the chief elected official must serve.

I say to my good friend from Kentucky that if we could get around that point—and I will explain at greater length why I feel that way—then the remainder of that sentence to which I take exception, I think, might be worked out.

In other words:

Representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

That is all right. That is fine. That is unobjectionable. So is the first sentence in subsection (a):

Each community action agency shall be established and maintained so as to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program, as developed and implemented, is fully responsive to community needs and conditions.

That is fine, too. But let me say to my good friend from Kentucky that the mayor of Philadelphia will not serve on the Community Action Board, and I believe he has a right not to serve on it.

The mayor of Philadelphia is strongly opposed to being a member of the Community Action Board. Also, the mayor of New York refuses to serve on it. I do not think we should put them in a strait-jacket and make them do it.

The mayor of Philadelphia does not wish to participate, and neither does the mayor of New York, by sending a designee to the Board, because they believe—in their cities where they know more about local conditions that do the Senator and I—that it should not be required.

We have accepted the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA] earlier. That, I think, goes about as far as is desirable to go. I would therefore hope that the Senator from Kentucky would not press his amendment to a rollcall vote because the difference between us is so small and the committee has given it very careful attention.

I have mentioned the mayors of Philadelphia and New York, but minority staff counsel has assured me that there are scores and scores of cities all over the country where the mayors do not want to designate anyone to these community action boards.

I can tell the Senator from Kentucky that when I was in Johnstown, Pa., which has a Republican mayor, in a city which has steadily been Democratic—and he is a competent and very decent fellow—he told me that he would not serve on that board for all the tea in China, because they are doing a good job and he did not want to mess it up with politics.

Thus, I would hope that the Senator from Kentucky would not press his amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I note that there are sections of my amendment, with the exception of the first section of (a), already in the bill. They were put in because of

the Montoya amendment in order to make this a proper amendment.

I thought that I had taken care of a situation in which an official said he would not serve by the following language: "or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person designated by such official."

The Senator says that the official might not want to designate a representative.

Mr. CLARK. That is right. He may not want to take responsibility for the community action agency, and I do not think we should make him.

Mr. COOPER. As I said, my amendment is in line with the administration proposal. My thought in proposing the amendment is based on two grounds: first, that the local officials ought to take some responsibility in this field. If they would not themselves serve, then they should appoint delegates.

There is a growing kind of friction, we have to admit, in some communities in some areas of our country, between the elected or appointed officials of the community and the governing boards of the community action programs. I thought it would be much better if the official's delegate served on the board, so that this kind of trend would be stopped.

I have voted for these programs. I want them to succeed. But I do not think they will succeed unless the Federal Government is able to bring to its assistance—to the fullest extent—our local governments.

We have, in effect, created a third kind of government. We have the Federal Government, the State governments, and the local governments, which are instrumentalities of State governments. In addition we have the governing boards of these community action programs which, in effect, have established themselves as a form of third government. I do not believe that this trend is beneficial to a community.

I believe that, by not requiring the official to serve, but providing that he may appoint a delegate if he will not serve, that we will eliminate the problem the Senator has raised.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish I could agree with the Senator.

I wonder if the Senator will follow me as I suggest some language which might meet my objection. If the Senator will go to line 1, page 2, I would suggest inserting, after the word "shall" the words "if he so desires."

Then, in line 3, after the word "person," the words "may be."

So that the sentence, if it were amended as I suggest, would read, beginning at the end of line 6 on page 1:

Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall, if he so desires, include the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person may be designated by such official * * *

And so on with the language the Senator from Kentucky used.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I will accept that language.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator ask to modify his amendment?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Perhaps I had better do it.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am informed by the Parliamentarian that the Senator from Kentucky would have to do it.

Mr. COOPER. Very well.

Mr. President, as suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I think it is a good suggestion—I modify the language of my amendment. I will read it as it would be modified.

Mr. CLARK. The second sentence.

Mr. COOPER. The wording on page 1, at the end of line 6, would read:

Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall—

And this is the new language—
if he so desires include the chief elected official or officials of the community—

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will stop there, I guess we ought to say "he or they."

Mr. COOPER. Yes. It would read—
whose members shall if he or they so desire the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person—

And I add the words:
may be designated—

Mr. CLARK. "Or persons."

Mr. COOPER—
a person or persons may be designated by such official—

Mr. CLARK. Then continue with the amendment as presently worded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, No. 359, as modified, is as follows:

On page 48, beginning with line 11, strike out all through line 4, page 49, and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall be established and maintained so as to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program, as developed and implemented, is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board whose members shall if he or they so desire include the chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the failure of any such official to serve, a person or persons may be designated by such official and other appropriate public officials or their representatives and representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

"(b) At least one-third of the membership of the board shall be persons who are selected by residents of the areas and members of the groups served. Each community action agency shall establish procedures by which appropriate representation is provided (1) to poor persons living in neighborhoods where poverty is concentrated, and (2) to other poor persons including the elderly and rural residents living outside these neighborhoods. All members of the governing board selected to represent specific geographic areas must reside in the area they represent.

"(c) The Director shall require community action agencies to establish procedures under which community agencies and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves inadequately represented on the governing board may petition for adequate representation."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 360.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 360) is as follows:

On page 56, beginning with "The" in line 6, strike out all through line 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Director shall make arrangements under which the State bar association and the local bar association in the community to be served by any proposed project authorized by this paragraph shall be consulted and afforded an adequate opportunity to submit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the proposed project before such project is approved or funded, and to submit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the operations of such project, if approved and funded."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this amendment will amend the bill at page 56, beginning with the word "The" on line 6. It would strike out the language beginning with the word "The" on line 6 and through line 11.

I must say it is not a tremendously significant amendment, but it relates to another problem which has been raised by my friends in Kentucky. The present language of the bill provides that in assisting in the provision of legal services to the poor, the director shall make arrangements with the principal bar associations in the area. My amendment provides that, in addition, they shall seek the advice and comments of the State bar association. I believe that State bar associations are more broadly based, and they usually have a staff which is better able to provide helpful assistance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think bringing the State bar associations into the picture is a useful amendment, and I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 360) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

URBAN ACTION PLAN OF REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in our debate on the pending war on poverty amendments it was most important to have before us the most authoritative

and informed program prepared under the chairmanship of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, by the policy committee of the Republican Governors' Association and issued in Albany, N.Y., on August 14, 1967.

I ask unanimous consent that the nine-point action plan and the lists of the Governors participating and endorsing it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the plan and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION PLAN TO INAUGURATE A NEW ERA OF CREATIVE STATE LEADERSHIP TO MEET THE NATIONAL CRISIS OF SOCIAL INJUSTICE AND LAWLESSNESS

(Recommended by: the Republican Governors Association Policy Committee, Aug. 10, 1967)

STATE OF NEW YORK,
Albany, August 14, 1967.

HON. JOHN A. LOVE,
Chairman, Republican Governors Association,
State Capitol, Denver, Colo.

DEAR GOVERNOR LOVE: This letter is to formally transmit to you the final document of the Nine-Point Action Plan entitled, "a new era of creative state leadership to meet the national crisis of social injustice and lawlessness" recommended at the meeting of the Policy Committee of the Republican Governors Association on August tenth.

Those participating in the development and endorsement of this Policy Committee program were:

Governor Spiro T. Agnew.
Governor Nils A. Boe.
Governor David F. Cargo.
Governor John H. Chafee.
Governor Daniel J. Evans.
Governor John A. Love.
Governor Tom McCall.
Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller.
Governor George W. Romney.
Governor Raymond P. Shafer.
Governor John A. Volpe.

We are proceeding with the organization of the non-partisan States' Urban Action Center, as called for in the report, to service the governors of all fifty states in developing their respective programs to deal with these critical problems.

Thanks for your untiring efforts in connection with the drafting of this action plan.

Best wishes,
Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Chairman, Policy Committee.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The tragic epidemic of riots convulsing the core areas of so many American cities underscores the basic responsibilities of state governments.

We are totally concerned about every aspect of this tragic problem. First, obviously, is maintenance of order under law. On it rests not only any viable society but also all other affirmative programs. We must assure the protection of persons and property in the peaceful and lawful pursuits of life. But relying only on better organized force, as some are advocating, forecasts the unacceptable ultimate result of a society based on repression. If our belief in an open society of freedom under the law is to survive, it must be based on a basic agreement among the people and a dedication to the goal that all shall have a stake in the potential and promise of America.

The time for effective action to meet this crisis of urban chaos is now.

We cannot afford delay.

The states can and must play a leading role both in preserving order under the law and in dealing with the root causes of civil disorder.

The Policy Committee of the Republican Governors Association has met, therefore, to determine a positive course of state action commensurate with the staggering dimensions of the problem.

The times demand a firm national commitment to resolve this leading domestic issue. Each of us must work in our respective states to develop solutions to these problems.

PROBLEMS

The recent outbreaks of lawlessness have placed new demands on state governments to stop civil strife and to maintain law and order. The increasing incidence of crime in the streets plaguing so many cities, aggravated by the riots, has made it clear that many localities cannot combat crime effectively alone.

Many of the urban problems of today, which result in human degradation, transcend the boundaries of local political jurisdictions. Individual cities lack the financial resources necessary to meet these problems. The Federal Government, while it has enacted many imaginative programs, is not providing the financial resources on a scale commensurate with the dimensions of the problem and, in many cases, the effectiveness of federal programs is inhibited by unnecessary inflexibility in their administration.

The states must do their part in providing the creative leadership to achieve the solution to today's urban crisis. This solution must be based on a new kind and degree of cooperative action between the various levels of government and the private sector of the society.

For we are confronted by a problem so pervasive that its solution is not one that can be resolved by governments alone.

We recognize that merely pouring more money into outmoded programs will not do the job. We seek new ways to tap the creative and constructive forces in society. Government can and must provide incentives, tools, and funds; but, the disadvantaged must be given an opportunity to achieve a stake in our society through the investment of their own aspirations and energy.

AGREEMENT FOR ACTION

We agree that the crisis is not just a city problem but is the inevitable result of indifference throughout our society. We must therefore mobilize public and private sectors in our states on a scale large enough to assure action on a scale necessary to meet the problem.

We recommend the following action plan of state leadership. We recognize that specific elements of this plan will have greater applicability in some states than in others, and that each state must determine the programs and priorities best suited to its situation and its capacities.

The following action plan includes specific measures regarding state action to:

- I. Maintain Order Under Law.
- II. Transform the Physical Environment of Slums and all Neglected Areas into Decent Communities.
- III. Increase Job Opportunities.
- IV. Improve Educational Opportunities.
- V. Improve Public Services to Individuals.
- VI. Expand Cultural and Recreational Opportunities in Neglected Areas.
- VII. Encourage Individual Citizen and Private Institutional Participation.
- VIII. Assure State Government's Capacity to Meet Urban Problems.
- IX. Encourage Flexibility, Speed and Adequate Funding of Federal Programs.

I. STATE ACTION TO MAINTAIN ORDER UNDER LAW AND CONTROL CRIME

The long standing failure of our society to fully enforce laws relating to housing codes, health and sanitary conditions, gambling, narcotics and other social conditions has discouraged confidence and encouraged

a disrespect for the law as an instrument for correcting social injustice. Effective law enforcement depends on a just, a firm and an even application of all our laws including those correcting basic social ills as well as those designed to preserve law and order.

When, however, for whatever cause, lawlessness and violence do occur, prompt, firm law enforcement on a sufficient scale is absolutely necessary to prevent isolated incidents from erupting into full scale riots.

We must never lose sight of the fact, when civil disorder threatens, that among those who most need protection of law and order are the resident in the threatened areas, the overwhelming majority of whom are law-abiding, responsible citizens.

Civil disorders

A. Local Police: Develop a state program and support legislation providing for interlocking agreements between local law enforcement agencies to permit "pooling" of officers and equipment. In addition, make certain that local officials clearly understand the procedures for utilizing state law enforcement resources.

B. Local Fire Fighting: Develop a state program and support for interlocking agreements among local fire departments to permit "pooling" manpower and fire fighting equipment.

C. State Police: Strengthen law enforcement capacity at the state level for the purpose of assisting in emergencies.

D. National Guard: Request the Federal Government in determining policies for the National Guard, to emphasize now the Guard's responsibility to serve as a tactical force for maintaining order within the states as well as its responsibility in national defense.

Specifically:

1. Urge the Federal Government to provide adequate and more modern and mobile equipment for all Guard forces to enable them to deal with civil disturbances.

2. Request the Federal Government to review the planned reorganization of the Guard in relation to its tactical role in maintaining civil order, giving particular attention to the number of men available for duty and the availability of high level command forces in each state.

3. Endorse the recent action taken by the President to improve and increase riot control training for all Guard units and urge its immediate implementation.

E. Federal Troops: Review federal and state law and procedures pertaining to the timely commitment of federal troops.

F. Review State Constitutional and Statutory Provisions to assure adequate authority for the Governor to meet emergency situations. Such a review would consider the powers of the Governor in an emergency situation with respect to various levels of law enforcement agencies, setting of curfews, restricting the sale of guns and ammunition, restricting the sale of liquor, closing streets and other public access routes, and the taking of other emergency steps.

Crime prevention and control

G. Comprehensive State Crime Control Programs and Plan: Establish a Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement and Administration of Criminal Justice, including officials responsible for crime prevention and enforcement as well as individual rehabilitation, to develop a comprehensive, statewide plan to strengthen crime prevention and juvenile delinquency controls, and generally upgrade criminal justice. Provide financial assistance to local governments to implement the plan, subject to evaluation and coordination by the Governor's Committee.

H. Support those portions of the "Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967" which would provide for state agency approval.

I. Training of Police: State legislation to mandate minimum training requirements for local police and supervisory personnel with appropriate state financial support.

J. Police Compensation: Assure just compensation for state and local police, such compensation to be related to the responsibilities which these officials bear.

K. Encourage community relations programs to recognize the effective work of the vast majority of dedicated law enforcement officers. Take prompt action against the relative few who derogate law enforcement in the public eye by abuse of authority or by use of excessive force.

II. STATE ACTION TO TRANSFORM THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT OF SLUM AREAS AND ALL NEGLECTED AREAS

A. Mobilize all public and private resources by state action to bring about a complete and basic transformation, rather than piecemeal projects, of slum areas. Comprehensive, well-designed developments, including housing, commercial, industrial, recreational, and community facilities are essential if individuals are to have decent housing and job opportunities.

State action would include the provision of necessary constitutional and statutory authority, and the development of mechanisms to:

1. Finance the development costs and sponsor comprehensive developments in conjunction with private resources.

2. Provide investment capital for projects including housing, commercial and industrial facilities.

3. Pre-finance federal urban development programs.

B. Provide state financial assistance for the development and enforcement of adequate building and housing codes.

C. Encourage home improvements in deteriorating and sub-standard housing by providing tax incentives for such improvements.

D. Propose and implement state legislation regarding prosecution of slum landlords including authorization of "receivers" to collect rents and make repairs.

E. Provide state financial and technical assistance to localities for rat extermination programs.

F. Provide state financial and technical assistance to improve collections and methods of disposal for garbage and other solid waste.

G. Develop a program of state financial assistance to help assure adequate mass transportation throughout urban areas to facilitate ready access to jobs.

H. Support state open housing legislation and its effective implementation so that all citizens may live where their hearts desire and their means permit.

I. State action to encourage zoning policies which overcome social, economic or racial segregation.

J. State action to require that real estate agents make available lists of all openings for rentals and properties for sale to every client.

III. STATE ACTION TO INCREASE JOB OPPORTUNITIES

A. Call State Conferences (1) with industries to increase job opportunities, including across-the-board hiring of the disadvantaged and genuine merit promotions; and (2) with unions to secure removal of discriminatory hiring policies and other restrictive measures prohibiting true equality in job opportunities.

B. Provide a state manpower training program to supplement federal programs and meet particular needs of each state.

C. Support state legislation to grant tax incentives to business to locate in slum areas and train workers.

D. Provide state technical assistance to small businesses in urban areas.

E. Expand apprenticeship training programs in cooperation with unions.

F. Promote apprenticeship training in small establishments.

G. Provide state subsistence allowances for job trainees.

H. Inaugurate state programs for recruiting, training and hiring slum area residents for public employment.

I. Establish a State Manpower Training Academy for training of staff needed in job counseling programs.

J. Develop special summer employment programs including a state beautification program employing youths in the community.

K. Provide state financial assistance to local child day-care services to help parents who want to have gainful employment.

L. State action to provide incentive for welfare recipients to undertake training and gainful employment by permitting income plus welfare benefits to total more than the amount they could receive under welfare benefits alone.

M. Action by state government to promote and enforce equal employment practices in both public and private employment. Contract Compliance Programs should be vigorously implemented.

IV. STATE ACTION TO IMPROVE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

A. Provide state assistance for pre-kindergarten programs.

B. To promote excellence in education, assure that state aid to education formulas recognize special problems of slum area schools including the need for smaller classes.

C. Establish a "community school program" to make the local school a year-round focal point for programs for all residents of slum areas and to encourage the interest of parents of school children in their children's education, health and recreation. The "community school program" would also provide ample social and health services for the children.

D. Establish a statewide Teachers Reserve to encourage trained but inactive teachers to return to teaching on either a full or part-time basis.

E. Establish a vocational education system which would have no entrance requirements and would provide work-study programs so that students could study and earn money at the same time.

F. Assure that vocational education courses reflect current labor market conditions.

G. Provide state financial assistance for Urban College Centers in slum areas to make available special academic and vocational training.

H. Provide adequate state scholarship and student loan programs to assure that no youth is denied the opportunity for a college education because of the lack of financial resources.

I. Develop special state programs to identify talented youngsters who need special help to meet college entrance requirements.

V. STATE ACTION TO IMPROVE PUBLIC SERVICES TO INDIVIDUALS

A. Develop an Interstate Cooperative Training and Orientation Program which would be available to those who have moved or are planning to move from a rural area in one state to an urban area of another state.

B. Establish a State Urban Extension Program to utilize successful agricultural extension techniques and to apply research conducted in universities to the solution of urban problems.

C. Support state legislation to assure adequate consumer protection and education programs.

D. Provide state financial assistance to meet the unique health and mental health needs of slum dwellers.

E. Develop a state program for comprehensive one-stop government service centers

to provide convenient and coordinated services.

F. Provide state support for local human rights commissions so that effective human relations programs, and civil rights enforcement can be implemented so far as possible at the local level.

VI. STATE ACTION TO EXPAND CULTURAL AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN ALL NEGLECTED AREAS

A. Develop a state program of financial and technical assistance for the development of recreational and cultural facilities.

B. Expand programs of State Arts Councils to bring exhibitions and performances to slum areas.

C. Utilize governmental facilities in and near slum areas to provide artistic and historical exhibitions.

D. Provide technical assistance to community and civic groups who wish to sponsor cultural events.

E. Encouragement by states of the use of private resources to develop neighborhood centers for civic and recreational programs.

VII. ENCOURAGE INDIVIDUAL CITIZEN AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONAL PARTICIPATION

A. State leadership to encourage participation by leaders of private organizations, churches, service clubs and civic groups in shaping creative and cooperative new programs in dealing with urban problems.

B. State action to establish an effective link on a continuing basis between the people of disadvantaged areas and government.

C. Organize and promote programs which bring together volunteers who want to help, with people who need help.

D. Organize programs using college and high school students as volunteer tutors for children who need special educational assistance.

E. State action to assure an effective dialogue, at the community level, between people of different races.

F. Work with private transportation and recreation enterprises to make their facilities more available to disadvantaged groups.

G. Work out cooperative arrangements between the state and news media to publicize job opportunities.

H. Provide incentives and facilitate the investment of private capital into urban development on a scale commensurate with the magnitude of the problem in order to accelerate necessary action to accomplish the objective as quickly as possible.

VIII. STATE ACTION TO ASSURE STATE GOVERNMENT'S CAPACITY TO MEET URBAN PROBLEMS

A. Strengthen the role of the Governor and provide him with adequate staff including appropriate central staff agencies such as planning and budgeting offices so that the Governor can effectively plan, mobilize and coordinate the use of federal, state, local and private resources to meet today's urban problems.

B. Develop a comprehensive environmental plan under the direction of the Governor for the social, economic and physical development of each state and its urban areas.

C. Provide state financial and technical assistance to local governments for planning.

IX. STATE ACTION TO ENCOURAGE FLEXIBILITY, SPEED AND REALISM IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

A. Urge federal legislation authorizing states to pre-finance federal programs.

B. Support action by the Federal Government authorizing block grants and revenue sharing to help assure a comprehensive, flexible approach to problems and make the most effective use of separate but related federal, state and local programs.

C. Encourage realistic assessment by the Federal Government of available financial resources to fund federal programs in order to avoid the turning of hopes into frustrations.

* * * * *

This then is the Action Plan recommended by the Policy Committee of the Republican Governors Association for confronting the crisis in our cities. The steps necessary to implement elements of this program will vary from state to state depending on existing administrative, fiscal and statutory authority. Some steps will require enabling state legislation and special sessions of state legislatures may be required in some states.

The adoption of this program by Republican Governors represents a powerful commitment by leaders of state government to meet this towering domestic challenge of our time through creative state leadership.

Accordingly, we have agreed to establish a States' Urban Action Center to serve all Governors to:

Provide a team of experts in the various program areas to help tailor specific programs to the needs of individual states.

Receive and disseminate information on actions taken by the states to implement this Nine-Point Action Plan so that all states will have the benefit of the experience in each state.

Applications have already been made to foundations to finance the State's Urban Action Center.

The objectives of this program are non-political. It is a program to provide opportunity. The true national interest can only be served through complete cooperation at all levels of government on a bi-partisan basis with the full support of private citizens.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. I ask that the Senator from California be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

TEMPORARY HOUSING

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I should like to invite, if I may, a colloquy on a phase of the subject under discussion before the Senate. I refer to temporary housing, which has been part of the overall plan to help migrant workers, under the FHA part of the plan that has been taken over by OEO. As the chairman will recall, I offered an amendment which the committee accepted adding "temporary housing" as one of the authorized IIIB programs.

One of the great examples of OEO's sometimes unfortunate administration and complete disregard for the wishes of the local and State people has to do with the temporary housing program in the State of California.

Members of the Poverty Subcommittee who were able to attend the California hearings and field trips saw the State's temporary housing program. The committee viewed, I believe, as I did a housing project at Harney Lane, which is in the Stockton area in California's famous San Joaquin Valley.

This delightful development surprised most of the members of the subcommittee and made a very favorable impression on all Senators present. These same Senators have endorsed the temporary housing program and have expressed their displeasure and opposition to the

Office of Economic Opportunity's termination of this worthwhile project. This project, part of the overall California migrant master plan, is one poverty program which is demonstrating visible, practical, and successful accomplishments.

It has obviously accomplished one of the main purposes which we desired and which, at the outset, was one of the established priorities of the entire OEO program. It created an attitude of pride among the migrants themselves, and all with whom it was discussed, and all spoke very enthusiastically about the successful project. It should also be pointed out, Mr. President, that the project at Harney Lane, in addition to providing adequate housing, offers programs in health, in education, in day care, and in sanitation. All in all, it is a first-class practical application of what I believe we in Congress have been trying to do. I was most pleased to be a member of the committee of the host State when the Senators had a chance to view this program.

I was particularly impressed with one of the school programs which I had the good fortune to observe. Since some of the youngsters spoke English and others Spanish, a real challenge was presented. This apparent language barrier was overcome by teaching the English-speaking youngsters Spanish and the Spanish-speaking youngsters English.

We found the English-speaking youngsters had as much interest and enthusiasm for the chance to learn to speak Spanish as did the Spanish-speaking youngsters to learn English. In other words, what was at first viewed as a handicap turned out to be a real resource. Equal interest and enthusiasm was evidenced on both sides, and the language barrier, was successfully overcome.

Mr. President, this temporary housing program has the strong support of everyone that I know of who is knowledgeable in the area of migrants and their problems. Yet, this successful program does not qualify for OEO's priority list. Perhaps it is too successful. It may be that the problem has disappeared, and therefore no help is needed—though I do not think that is the case. Sometimes one is given the impression that OEO's priority list encompasses only those activities which have not been tried, or have been tried and have not proved successful or possible. For these there seems to be unlimited funds and unlimited resources.

Dr. Paul F. O'Rourke, former State poverty director under Governor Brown, characterized OEO's actions in refusing to fund temporary housing programs in the following manner:

One of the decisions which recently has distressed me is an OEO decision not to permit the State of California to continue its temporary housing program and support for the families you saw today . . . It just got rolling in California. This is an example where the central authority does something inimical to what we have been trying to accomplish in the state.

Mr. President, I believe bureaucrats in Washington should not be permitted to do that which is contrary to the interests of the local people and certainly to the interests of the migrants. I offered, in

committee, an amendment which includes the temporary housing as part of the programs that can be funded under title III (B). I want to make the legislative record absolutely clear that within the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare there is now the strongest support for the continuation of this temporary housing program which the committee had a chance to view and examine while they were in California. I want to make the record as clear as possible, Mr. President, that it is the intent of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the temporary housing program in California will be continued, that its continuation will be made possible, and that its priority will be reestablished high on the list of the programs of the OEO.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator for the statement he has just made. He and I and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] went through the San Joaquin Valley, I believe it was last spring—

Mr. MURPHY. Last spring.

Mr. CLARK. At the time the cherry crop was almost ready to be picked, and we saw the temporary migrant housing which had been built to take care of the workers who followed the fruit crops from south to north during the course of the year.

Like the Senator from California, I was very much impressed with these temporary housing programs. We found in one camp—which actually was a camp for single men, a sort of bachelors' and widowers' camp—an extremely competent cook from Pittsburgh, who was giving these migrant workers—some of whom were younger fellows but most of them veterans of the fruit and vegetable picking—two good meals a day; and they had a chance to get a cold lunch.

The barracks, as one might call them, or dormitories, were clean and neat, and gave adequate protection from the weather, and I was very much impressed with them. Where that sort of facility does not exist, the migrant people often live in squalor.

We went from there to another area where they had temporary housing for families. And they practically had a Headstart program going among the kids there in a sort of classroom which had been set aside for that purpose.

The mothers were doing a lot of the teaching, and a number of volunteer girls had come in from the neighboring town of Stockton to help give these kids the normal educational processes.

These children were, to be sure, in the kindergarten and the earlier grades. And the houses, although temporary, were neat and clean, and they were well kept up by the migrant families. I was very much impressed.

Then, we went out, I suppose not more than 10 miles away, and saw a family of five or six living in an automobile under a bridge over a dry ditch. There was another family—my recollection may be inadequate, but I think there were six or seven in that family—living in a sort of pup tent with a kerosene stove. The conditions were really deplorable. The

reason was that there was not enough temporary housing.

I was depressed when we heard testimony from the OEO officials to the effect that they were planning to phase out this temporary housing for migrants. Their reason was that they felt in due time all migrant labor was going to be phased out and disappear, that the picking would be taken over to a certain extent by new agricultural equipment, and that local labor would pick the rest. They did not want to encourage the continuation of migrant labor by giving them adequate housing.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. This is another phase of the long, continuing discussion that we have had in this Chamber. It is further proof that sometimes the people 3,000 miles away do not understand the actual condition.

I know of the program designed to phase out the use of migrant labor. I think it would be a wonderful thing if this could be brought about, but I do not really see any progress, or very little progress, if any, at the present time.

In my remarks this morning I pointed out that the Secretary of Labor himself had made the statement last week that there were 40,000 to 50,000 green card workers in the State of California at the present time.

My information from the Bureau of Immigration would lead me to believe that since Public Law 78 went out of existence, there have been thousands of illegal wetbacks in California.

It is my hope that as soon as this condition is corrected, the people who are actually necessary as agricultural workers in California will be quickly provided under the law and properly brought in and properly examined and, may I say, properly housed under conditions such as the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and I saw in the particular instance to which we referred.

I was very pleased that the old housing project that used to be displayed in California was not displayed any longer and that there was public housing for the migrant worker that we could be proud of. That housing was comfortable, clean, adequate, and perfectly acceptable.

That is why I made my remarks today, in the hope that the members of the committee who were present with me would urge the Senate to restore the funds with which to keep the project going until these workers would no longer be needed.

This type of housing is very badly needed today.

I thank my esteemed friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for his concurrence in the remarks I have made in regard to this matter.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator will recall that when the adverse position on temporary housing was brought up in the hearings before the subcommittee, several of us indicated our disapproval of cutting back these programs.

There is in the report a recommendation from the committee to continue and, indeed, to expand temporary housing.

And we have \$3 million extra in there for that purpose.

I find myself completely in accord with the Senator from California. I am glad that he made the comments he did on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] offers an amendment, as follows:

Strike out all of Title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through and including line 11, page 126, as follows:

"TITLE II—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Emergency Employment Act of 1967'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds that certain communities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by severe unemployment and underemployment. Such areas contain large concentrations or proportions of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular competitive employment because of lack of education, occupational skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement. This situation is aggravated by migration of unskilled rural residents to urban areas. Many of the affected areas are doubly handicapped by the lack of sufficient jobs for all the potential labor force. This condition is destructive of human dignity and results in a loss of national productivity. In many localities the problem has reached crisis proportion by contributing to social unrest and civil disorder.

"(b) At the same time there is a huge backlog of need for additional public services and public facilities in such fields as those which (1) contribute to the development of human potential, (2) better the conditions under which people live, learn, and work, and (3) aid in the development and conservation of natural resources.

"(c) Therefore, it is the purpose of this title to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest by fulfilling unmet needs.

"ELIGIBLE AREAS

"SEC. 203. The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall designate urban and rural areas to be eligible for assistance under this title. Such areas shall contain a high concentration or proportion of low-income families and individuals and shall have severe problems of unemployment and underemployment. They may be defined without regard to political boundaries.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations for part or all of the costs of programs which create meaningful public service and other employment opportunities. He shall adopt procedures to assure (1) that there is maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility with full participation of and maximum cooperation among local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and representatives of private organizations in the establishment of pro-

grams under this title, including, without limitation, the determination of areas and participants eligible for assistance and the selection of projects under subsection (b) of this section, and (2) that such assistance is fully coordinated with programs operated under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal Acts.

"(b) Jobs created or made available under this title may include services and supporting facilities in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such jobs shall include (1) those which can be made available immediately to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain employment, (2) those which provide placement resources for persons completing training under titles I and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and other relevant manpower training programs, and (3) those which use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic labor surplus. Priority shall be given to projects which are labor intensive in character.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to assure that (1) persons employed in jobs created by this title are provided opportunity for further education, training, and necessary supportive services, including those provided by other relevant Acts, so that they may be prepared to obtain regular competitive employment in the future; and (2) that maximum effort is made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons.

"LOANS

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans to public and private agencies for the purchase of supplies and equipment which support and supplement projects carried out by participants under section 204.

"(b) Loans authorized under this section may be made without interest and under such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 206. Participants in programs under this title must be unemployed or low-income persons who reside in eligible areas and who meet other criteria prescribed by the Secretary. Low income shall be defined in terms of section 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this title unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) wages paid a participant shall not be lower than, whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for

the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rate of wages in the area for similar work.

"(4) the program will, to the extent appropriate, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs related to physical improvements preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families in urban neighborhoods or rural areas having concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this title have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"(d) Programs approved under this title shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 208. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress made in implementing this title and suggestions for improvements on or before May 15, 1968, November 15, 1968, and on or before May 15 and November 15 of each year thereafter.

"AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 209. (a) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this title, except the provisions of section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and \$1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

"(b) For the purpose of making loans under section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(c) Appropriations authorized by this section shall remain available until expended."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending amendment the vote occur at 3 o'clock Monday next.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I was detained by a colloquy with other Senators and did not hear the reading of the amendment.

Do I correctly understand that the pending amendment would, if agreed to, strike title II?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am not making this statement to object, but to be constructive. A Senator sometimes will withdraw a request when I ask him to yield. I do not want him to do that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will not.

Mr. JAVITS. There are perhaps other amendments which Senators may like to have considered which could come between now and Monday. And Senators, for strategic reasons, may choose to have votes contiguous to and immediately pre-

ceding the 3 o'clock time. So that we may understand the situation, there may be other votes in addition to the vote set at 3 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has an excellent idea. The distinguished Senator from West Virginia did raise that question and did ask me to consider the possibility of laying aside his amendment from time to time to take up other amendments.

I think it would be agreeable and would fit in with the suggestion of the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Senators might decide that they would like a vote at the same time for strategic reasons.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We can accommodate them.

Mr. CLARK. Do I correctly understand that we can set the pending amendment aside almost immediately to take up the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, or perhaps other amendments and try to dispose of them before Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if a motion to recommit were in order, perhaps that would have to fit into this picture. If a motion to recommit with instructions were made on Monday, that naturally in the course of parliamentary procedure would take priority over other votes.

There would be authority for such motion to be made if it were to come up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that it would be taken care of. It is privileged.

If my recollection of parliamentary procedure is correct, one can offer an amendment to recommit after third reading.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Or, even after having consented to vote at 3 o'clock on Monday, as I understand it, a motion to recommit, if made, would become the immediate business and would be voted on even prior to the vote on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the request of the Senator include not only the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia but also all other amendments thereto?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not exactly. The request is that the pending amendment be laid aside temporarily for the purpose of taking up other amendments if they become available.

Could the Chair rule on the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Delaware? I think he stated it correctly, but I would like a confirmation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The question raised was that assuming on Monday we are proceeding toward a unanimous-consent time to vote, and a motion to recommit with instructions were made, which automatically would take priority over any other vote, would such a motion be in order at any time if it were offered during the course of the debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not unless it is excepted now; because if there were a motion to recommit and it were

agreed to, there would be nothing to vote on at 3 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I temporarily withhold my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JAVITS. May I make a suggestion to the majority leader to accommodate this situation? It is just a suggestion, and Senator CLARK may not consent to it.

Could it also be part of the unanimous-consent request that if any motion to recommit is made in the interim, it will be voted prior to the vote on the Byrd amendment on Monday at 3 o'clock?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that we may discuss this matter without it being in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Oregon yield for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I do not yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 602) to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1320) to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1862) to amend the authorizing legislation on the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia).

THE PROPOSED 10-PERCENT SURTAX

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, unless the majority leader has objection, I shall proceed with a short speech I wish to make, a copy of which I have already sent to the Press Gallery. This is a speech in which, for the first time on the floor of the Senate, I announce my present position on the proposed 10-percent surtax. My final vote will depend on whether or not a course of action is followed by the administration along the lines that I outline in the speech.

Mr. President, as the war in Vietnam

continues without sign of ending, and as its cost continues to burden the national budget at the rate of some \$29 billion a year, Congress and the taxpaying public are being compelled to come to grips with the fact that there is no such thing as a cheap war. The list of American casualties has reached the 100,000 mark, over 13,000 of them dead. The human price is unmeasured. The sacrifice these men have made can never be calculated; it can never be repaid.

What Congress does have to deal with is the financial cost. The Defense Department spending will total around \$75 billion. On top of that, I understand that sometime early next year, Congress will be asked for an additional, supplemental appropriation to take care of Vietnam war costs that were not covered in the earlier budget estimate.

That is why some members of the Military Affairs Committees in Congress believe the cost of the war will be around \$35 billion in the current fiscal year.

This is the first war in history that we have tried to wage without any wartime financial measures on the home front. There has been no tax increase; there have been no wage and price controls; there has been no allocation of scarce materials to keep prices down. We have done it all by borrowing. The result of this has been a sharp rise in interest rates and a considerable rise in the general price level.

The administration is increasing the pressure on Congress for a 10-percent surtax on personal and corporation income taxes to raise \$7½ billion toward the cost of the war. The administration estimates that it can cut another \$7½ billion out of nondefense spending. By these means, it hopes to reduce the deficit to \$14 billion.

We know that the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is now engaged in a kind of test of nerves with the administration; it wants to see the budget cuts before it acts on the surtax. The administration wants Congress to pass all the appropriation bills first, and says that then it will decide where to impound money.

The heart of the issue is this: If all the cuts are to come in nondefense spending, where are they to be made? The interest on the debt amounts to over \$14 billion, and that cannot be cut. Veterans' benefits are statutory and amount to some \$7 billion. They cannot be cut. That leaves such expenditures as highway construction, space exploration, the poverty program, education, agricultural programs, public works by the Corps of Engineers, conservation, water pollution control, and health resources among which to make these cuts. And these are only some of the domestic programs. Many people think the war on poverty should be cut back. But it could be eliminated altogether and we would save less than one-third of the target, because the war on poverty is budgeted at less than \$2 billion.

It is the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon that if a cut is made in the poverty program, we will spend many times the amount of money cut in meeting the crises that will develop in the

metropolitan areas of the country, where tens of thousands of fellow Americans are below the poverty line. We can have all the law enforcement available—and I am for law enforcement—but no amount of law enforcement will stop the direct action protests of Americans who see their children suffering from malnutrition, recognizing the want and the degradation that the present occupant of the chair and I and 180 million people like us are imposing upon fellow Americans who are suffering the pangs of poverty and hunger and deprivation in the Republic.

Therefore, to talk about cutting any of these needed domestic programs, in my judgment, does not make sense and cannot be reconciled with congressional duties to our country.

That is why I shall make a suggestion before I finish this speech as to where, in my judgment, the cuts must be made.

Moreover, most of these programs were already reduced below authorized amounts in the January budget. Another cut would reduce to impotence such activities as water pollution control and many of our education programs, at a time when the problems in both are growing. Many public works projects urgently needed in Oregon—and in all States, for that matter—have already been omitted from the current budget; more of them stand to be cut under this procedure. The same is true of many agricultural development programs.

I cannot accept the idea that this \$7½ billion should all come out of nondefense spending. It could come out of non-Vietnam spending. That is where it should come from. Let the senior Senator from Oregon make that statement again. The \$7.5 billion cut should not be made in the domestic programs so badly needed in this country in order to provide for the necessary welfare of the people who are entitled to those programs. The \$7.5 billion cut should be made in non-Vietnam defense spending. It should come out of the defense budget of \$75 billion, which apparently has become sacrosanct in the Republic. Apparently, we have already marched so far down the road to military domination of the budget of the Republic that any suggestion to cut \$7.5 billion out of a \$75 billion defense budget is not acceptable to many.

But I shall warn the Senate this afternoon where it is acceptable. It is acceptable to the American taxpayers. I warn the Senate this afternoon, before it is too late, that \$7.5 billion out of needed domestic programs may get by Congress, but it will not get by the country. We shall be held to an accounting, and we should be held to an accounting at the polls next November, because the taxpayers will not, in my judgment, accept those reductions in the domestic programs; they will consider it a betrayal of the public interest.

But the Defense Department continues to spend billions of dollars in places like Europe, which have no connection with the war in Vietnam. We continue to spend billions of the taxpayers' dollars in connection with non-Vietnam defense items all around the world.

I propose this afternoon that the \$7.5 billion be cut out of the \$75 billion defense budget for those expenditures that have to be postponed until we get out of the mess in South Vietnam and until we meet the dire needs of millions of our people who are entitled to have their needs met under a domestic appropriation bill.

I, therefore, cannot support a budget program that sacrifices the development of our country's human and natural resources in order to maintain 350,000 American soldiers in Germany, among other countries, when Germany herself will not fulfill her military manpower commitment to NATO; when Great Britain will not fulfill her military manpower commitment to NATO, but instead is talking about reducing her already undercommitted ratio to NATO. There is not a single member of NATO, except the United States, that has ever fulfilled its military manpower commitment to NATO.

There are those who would have us believe that the military budget is sacrosanct. We know if we do finally get into that war with Communist Russia—and God forbid—it will not be fought with conventional weapons; it will be a nuclear war, and that will be the end of both countries and many countries in between.

If ever there was a time for us to come to our senses in regard to the fiscal policies of this Republic it is now. Of course, we will have to spend whatever amount of money is necessary to honorably disengage ourselves from the war in Southeast Asia. And we all know the turn that is taking in public opinion. There is not a Member of this body who does not know that public opinion is turning against the war because they recognize that we cannot set ourselves up as the policeman of Asia. The rest of the world has made clear we will have to go it alone, and I speak of the major countries of the world.

Mr. President, you could not get the President of Italy, when he was in this country, to give us encouragement or support for our position in Vietnam; you could not get the Chancellor of Germany, who was in this body not so many days ago, who appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, who spoke before the Washington Press Club, and conferred with the President, to say words in support of our program in South Vietnam.

The sad fact is that month by month we are standing more isolated in the world because all the world recognizes we cannot justify the military course we are following in South Vietnam.

Mr. President, it is obvious from what has been said on this floor this week by other Senators, by Members of Congress of both political parties, that they are growing restive as these hard financial choices have to be made.

More of them are going to have to face up to the fact that it is the Vietnam war itself that is responsible for these hard choices. I think we are going to hear even more about the war in days ahead in terms of stopping it, or reducing its

scope rather than continuing to escalate the manpower, the casualties, the deaths, and the cost.

For a long time, a majority in Congress went along with the idea that we could have both guns and butter. Now, they are finding out that we cannot. For myself, I shall not support a tax increase that seeks to maintain every military program everywhere in the world, while cutting back only on domestic programs. Nor shall I support a tax increase that perpetuates loopholes for the oil industry, whereby everyone else pays for the war but that one big business, or that permits escapees to avoid taxes that are clearly their patriotic duty to pay on the basis of equality of tax liability and obligation.

I am not going to vote for an increase in taxes until this Congress is first willing to plug the tax loopholes, and every Senator knows where they are. There are so many that they make our tax structure look like a Swiss cheese.

A surtax raises taxes only for those already paying taxes. If we are to have a war tax, it should be levied on everyone, and if we are to have budget cuts because of the war, they should be imposed upon every governmental activity—including defense—that is not related directly to the war itself.

A large proportion of the \$7½ billion spending cut should come out of the Defense Department. It has far and away the most non-Vietnam expenditures of any department or activity of Government. Let the budget cuts start there.

A serious issue is developing in the domestic field of taxes to pay for the war. The House Ways and Means Committee has responded to the President's request for a 10-percent surtax by asking to see the budget cuts first.

But in a budget where defense spending of \$75 billion is considered untouchable, and interest on the debt and veterans' benefits are also untouchable, only some \$20 billion in funds for public works, education, urban development, space exploration, the war on poverty, highway construction, and agricultural programs is cuttable. How \$7.5 billion can be taken out of \$20 billion in domestic programs is the financial question Congress wants answered before it imposes a tax increase.

But the administration sets aside drastic cuts in the defense budget, and tries to mislead the American people into believing that when the senior Senator from Oregon and other Senators who have been urging cuts in the defense budget do so, we are somehow, in some way, weakening our stance in Vietnam. This is a non sequitur. The cuts we are talking about in the defense budget have nothing to do with Vietnam. The figures given us show that out of that \$75 billion in the defense budget, only \$22 billion is related to Vietnam.

CONGRESS MUST DECIDE BUDGET PRIORITIES

Mr. President, we have to make a reply to the President in regard to the matter of taxes and budget cuts. The President wants to get the appropriations and then he wants to decide where the appropriations will be spent, which again gives to him the discretion that I think we can-

not afford to give to that President—and I am not talking about a President as Mr. Johnson. I am talking about the Office of the Presidency of the United States. But it does not make any difference to me who occupies that Office with respect to this particular issue at this time.

We are close to being told that if Congress designates a billion dollars for highway construction, and the President signs the measure into law, his Budget Bureau may still take it upon itself to decide that the money shall not be spent. It is one thing to give the President statutory discretion in how much he may spend upon a given program; but it is quite another to make the specific appropriation and then have it impounded.

Here is an area where Congress will indeed have lost one of its great checks upon arbitrary executive action if it permits its power over the purse strings to be overridden by the Budget Bureau.

That is why I have been urging, in connection with foreign policy matters, that we exercise the check of the purse strings, and that we insist the money be administered in accordance with the exercise of the purse strings, and not permit a president of the United States to exercise an arbitrary discretion in regard to the expenditure of the money.

So, too, do I hope that Congress will continue to reject all recommendations that the President be authorized to fix tax rates. If the time ever comes when we delegate the tax power to the executive branch, the precious system of check and balance whereby our Constitution sought to protect our liberty will indeed be destroyed.

There is nothing in anything I have said that is directed at the President, or his Budget Director, or his Treasury Secretary, or his Defense Secretary, as individuals. We are confronted with the culmination of a long trend that has continued since World War II. It has seen Republican Congresses and Democratic Congresses delegate one function after another to the President and his Cabinet officers, and they, too, have been Democrats and Republicans.

I take some pride in the fact that I am the only Member of Congress who has voted against every undated war power delegated to the President since 1954. That period has encompassed the terms of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. I also take pride in a comment made by one of my friends from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who has had a great deal to do also with these issues. On August 22, during a discussion of Vietnam policy in the Senate, I was interrupted by Senator FULBRIGHT, who said:

The Senator referred to his having voted against every step of our involvement there. I pay the Senator tribute. I had occasion within the last few days to reread the debate on the Tonkin Gulf Joint Resolution that took place in August 1964. I pay tribute to the Senator for his part in the debate on that measure. The time that has elapsed since then has proven him to be practically the only one who was correct in the position he took with regard to that resolution in August 1964. And, in spite of the sadness and tragedy that has afflicted the country, as a Member of the Senate he ought to be very proud of his foresight at that time.

My colleague gave me undue credit, for it was not my foresight upon which my decision rested, but upon the foresight of the authors of the Constitution. They knew that unless each department of the Federal Government were given specific powers in foreign affairs, to be exercised by that department exclusively, our Government would be no different from all previous governments which have foundered along with the freedom of their people upon the shoal of unchecked executive authority.

Mr. President, I have pled time and time again, and plead again this afternoon, that the Senate stop delegating legislative prerogatives and responsibilities to the executive branch of the Government.

I am pleading again that the Senate return to the checks-and-balances system of the Constitution and exercise the check of the purse strings. The issue which is being raised over the tax issue and budget cuts, and over the choice between non-Vietnam defense spending and necessary domestic spending, goes right back to the basic constitutional concept as to whether we are going to carry out the trust of our oath that we would uphold the Constitution.

The Constitution puts in the hand of Congress, not the Executive, the authority to spend money.

Nor have we in Congress been "brain-washed." We have none to blame but ourselves. Too often we have found it easier to accept at face value what we are told, without asking questions, without finding out the whole picture for ourselves, without accepting our constitutional responsibility to make the decision of war, of spending, of foreign commitments.

The way in which our Constitution was written was designed to guard us, and the American people, from such errors.

There is some belated evidence now that Congress, at long last, is beginning to awaken and to recognize that it cannot slough off its duties in one area without jeopardizing its own freedom of action in other areas. That reawakening should continue. It should not move into reverse by delegating away the authority to appropriate or the authority to tax.

That is why I hope the Senate will soon take up the resolution now before the Foreign Relations Committee which has been offered by the great chairman of that committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. In it, he seeks to get the Senate to restate, for its own thinking, may I say—and it is needed—that Congress will insist upon taking back the reins which our constitutional fathers put into our hands to check an administration when it seeks to follow a course of action that cannot be reconciled with the responsibilities of Congress in the field of foreign policy.

Mr. President, it does not make me happy to make the remarks I have made this afternoon—because, of course, I would much prefer to find myself in agreement with my administration on matters of such vital concern as the tax bill or a budget cut. But, Mr. President, I cannot join the administration in its

proposal for a tax increase or upon its recommendations as to where the budget cuts shall be made, because I think that Congress owes it to the American taxpayers to take all, or most all, of that \$7.5 billion cut out of the defense spending elsewhere than Vietnam.

Therefore, unless evidence can be presented to me that has not been presented to me by the administration to date, that justifies, on the merits, not on the politics, but on the merits, the type of cut that spokesmen for the administration are urging upon Senators these days, I shall vote against their recommendations.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith with title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through page 126, line 11, stricken out.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, is that motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly.

Mr. JAVITS. Is that motion amendable in this way: Can the instructions to the committee to report back be amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that all instructions are amendable.

Mr. JAVITS. May those instruction include instructions with respect to changes to be made in the very item of the bill which would be stricken by the motion to recommit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such amendments would be in order as long as they relate to the bill itself, and are instructions to the committee.

Mr. JAVITS. As the bill stands now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has called up a motion which has not been printed, but which I hold in my hand, he having had the courtesy to hand it to me. It reads:

I move to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith with title II—

I think we are in trouble. I am going to ask the Senator to read it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith with title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through page 126, line 11, stricken out.

Mr. CLARK. It is clear enough.

Mr. President, is that the pending motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be the pending motion as soon as it has been stated by the clerk.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding it is debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is debatable.

Mr. CLARK. Since I have to leave pretty soon, I hope we can agree there will be no unanimous-consent agreement with respect to limitation of debate on this motion until we can confer tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be none.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it proper for the Senator from California to ask that the call for the yeas and nays be included in the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no unanimous-consent request before the Senate. There is a motion before the Senate.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, once the Senator gets the yeas and nays, the motion cannot be amended by any other Senator.

I am told that is not correct.

What is the rule which says once the yeas and nays have been ordered, a Senator cannot modify his motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator loses his right to modify the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. But any other Senator can modify it or amend it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He could amend it.

Mr. MURPHY. And the Senator may not modify it, but may withdraw?

Mr. MANSFIELD. He may not withdraw it once he gets the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk state the motion.

Mr. MURPHY. I have asked that the yeas and nays be ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, is that a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MURPHY. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated by the clerk. Then the Senate will act on the request for the yeas and nays.

The legislative clerk read the motion of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, as follows:

I move to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith with title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through page 126, line 11, stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second for the yeas and nays?

There is a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Where an effort is made to amend the instructions which are contained in the motion to recommit, in accordance with the previous rulings of the Chair, does the vote on each such amendment occur before the vote on the motion to recommit?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President. I did so only to request that the floor be cleared and that only those who are supposed to be on the floor remain on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair instructs the Sergeant at Arms that all unauthorized persons be cleared from the floor. The Chair would remind the attachés that this is the third time that we have had to do this this afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say, in extenuation of my suggestion, that I am finding it extremely difficult to differentiate between Senators and the staff.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the pending business be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the pending business.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] moves to recommit S. 2388, with instructions to report forthwith which title II, beginning on page 120, line 1, down through page 126, line 11, stricken out.

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I believe the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] feels there will not be a vote on the pending motion before Monday next. The Senate will meet tomorrow at noon, and it is hoped that action can be taken to dispose of several amendments on tomorrow. There may be roll-call votes; I cannot be sure.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 13026) to extend through March 1968 the first general enrollment period under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (relating to supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged), and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 29, 1967, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 28, 1967:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter N. Tobriner, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica, vice Wilson T. M. Beale, Jr.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PLANNING

Price Daniel, of Texas, to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, vice Farris Bryant.

IN THE AIR FORCE

William B. Duty, FR5739, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captains (Medical)

Birkmeyer, Eugene J., FV3199286.
Myers, John E., FV3125076.

To be first lieutenant (Medical)

Munn, William C., II, FV3166228.

To be captains (Dental)

Barton, Ralph T., FV3195971.

Kincaid Louis C., FV3166077.

Winkley, Donald F., FV2234116.

To be first lieutenants (Dental)

Logan, John L., FV3195972.

Smith, Robert N., FV3142771.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued October 2, 1967
For actions of September 29, 1967
90th-1st; No. 155

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	11,18	Food additives.....	25	Research.....	7
Air pollution.....	16	Food stamps.....	22	Rural affairs.....	21
Appalachia.....	1	Foreign aid.....	6	Rural development.....	8,14
Appropriations.....	13	Housing.....	28	Taxation.....	20
Budgeting.....	4	Hurricane damage.....	10	Textiles.....	24
Census.....	26	Job Corps.....	2	Tobacco.....	5
Congressional reform....	15	Labor standards.....	19	Transportation.....	3
Economy.....	4	Legislative program....	17	Water pollution.....	27
Education.....	23	Packers and stockyards..	12		
Expenditures.....	20	Poverty.....	2,9		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on Appalachia bill. Senate debated poverty bill. House committee voted to report continuing appropriations measure, and Rep. Bow discussed it. House passed bill to amend Packers and Stockyards Act. Rep. Sullivan inserted President's remarks in signing food stamp bill.

SENATE

1. **APPALACHIA.** Agreed to the conference report on S. 602, to revise and extend the Appalachia program. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S13879-81
2. **POVERTY.** Continued debate on S. 2388, the poverty bill (pp. S13877, S13892-3, S13924-5, S13931-8, S13940-5). Agreed to amendments by Sen. Prouty to provide for investigation and evaluation of poverty programs by GAO (pp. S13931-3), and to require that records on placement of Job Corps members be placed with

the Secretary of Labor (p. S13933). An amendment by Sen. Curtis, to repeal the Job Corps authorization, was pending at the end of the day (p. S13942).

3. TRANSPORTATION. The Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 1314, to "modernize" certain restrictions upon the application and scope of the exemption provided therein (S. Rept. 578). p. S13869
4. ECONOMY; BUDGETING. Sen. Proxmire inserted a statement which, he claimed, shows no inflationary pressure on military procurements. pp. S13883-4
Sen. Ribicoff recommended and inserted an article favoring Sen. Proxmire's proposal for a Federal program evaluation commission. p. S13924
Sen. Mondale inserted an article defending Federal spending and discussing interrelationships of the economy, taxation, and the budget. p. S13939
5. TOBACCO. Sen. Jordan, N. C., questioned the basis of objections to smoking and inserted an article, "Antismoking Figures Look Flimsy." p. S13890
6. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Hartke commended the International Executive Service Corps. pp. S13891-2
7. RESEARCH. Sen. Mondale inserted articles by Dick Youngblood describing technological and scientific discoveries of benefit to agriculture. pp. S13898-905
8. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserted an article, "Difficulties of Big Cities Tied to Ills of Small Towns." pp. S13927-9
9. POVERTY. Sen. Mondale inserted a letter from the Intercounty Community Council, Oklee, Minn., describing its actions under an OEO project. pp. S13939-40
10. HURRICANE DAMAGE. Sen. Yarborough reported on recent hurricane damage in Tex. and the President's inspection trip. pp. S13937-9
11. ADJOURNED until Mon., Oct. 2. p. S13945

HOUSE

12. PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS. Passed, 234 to 6, with a technical amendment H. R. 10673, to amend title III of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended (pp. (pp. H12748-55). The committee report states the primary purpose of this bill "is to make clear that a stockyard owner has the responsibility and right to manage his stockyard in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner, and to require persons operating at the stockyard to conduct their operations in a manner which will foster, preserve, and insure an efficient, competitive market, while preserving to the Secretary of Agriculture the right under the Packers and Stockyards Act to prevent any abuse of authority by the stockyard owner with respect to the matters involved in the bill."
13. APPROPRIATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Appropriations Committee "ordered reported favorably to the House H. J. Res. 853, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1968" (p. D868), and Rep. Bow stated that if the Rules Committee "had met yesterday on the continuing resolution, it could have been brought up today and action taken on it" (p. H12761)

This resolution suggests action toward solution of the international legal confrontations ahead of us and calls for wide ranging steps, including arms control measures, to achieve a reasonable legal order for the extranational world ocean.

I take the liberty of reading the text of this brief resolution, which is as follows:

Whereas, through developing technology man becomes increasingly capable of exploring, and exploiting the resources of, the deep sea; and

Whereas, this technology carries with it the threat of legal confrontations between nations of the world over the ownership and jurisdiction of the bed of the deep sea and the super-adjacent waters, and the resources therein; and

Whereas, the extension of the rule of law and the development of practicable arms control measures with respect to these territories are essential if mankind is to enjoy the fruits of his efforts in the deep sea: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should remain committed to the principle that the living and mineral resources in suspension in the high seas, beyond twelve miles from the coast, are free for the use of all nations, subject to international treaty obligations and the conservation provisions of the 1958 Geneva Conventions adopted by the United Nations-sponsored Conference on the Law of the Sea;

(2) the United States should urge the United Nations to consider the problems of conservation and use of marine resources of the seabed and subsoil beyond continental shelf limits and any licensing or other arrangements necessary for the regulation thereof;

(3) there is an urgent need for the establishment of an international agreement under which the floor of the deep sea and the resources of the seabed and subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of the continental shelf, will be considered free for the exploration and exploitation of all nations; and are incapable of coming under the sovereignty of any one nation or group of nations;

(4) any such international agreement should incorporate practicable arms control proposals looking toward mutually advantageous safeguard provisions, should encompass the results of an examination of the question of the emplacement of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction on the deep sea floor, and should contribute to a reduction of the world arms race by enjoining all nations from the stationing of unproven types of nuclear or other kinds of mass destruction weapons on the ocean floor where unique conditions are likely to cause greater risks of accidents;

(5) fixed limits must be set for defining the outer boundaries of the continental shelf of each nation, and that such limits can best be determined by an international conference to be convened by the United Nations in 1969, five years after the coming into force of the 1958 Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf; and

(6) the President should institute a detailed study within the Department of State and other interested departments and agencies of the United States and in cooperation with the United Nations with respect to the problems of criminal jurisdiction over, and the policing of, activities on and beneath the surface of extra-territorial seas and on the deep sea floor; should consider those situations both immediate and anticipated, which are not covered by existing international agreements, and should seek an early determination by the United Nations on the matter of developing and proposing regulations for handling those situations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 172) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENT; DISABILITY BENEFITS FOR THE BLIND

AMENDMENT NO. 366

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I submit an amendment to H.R. 12080, the substance of S. 1681, which I presented originally on May 3. The bill has a total of 58 cosponsors, and has twice before been passed by the Senate. On the first occasion, in the 88th Congress, the social security bill into which it was incorporated as a floor amendment became deadlocked in conference at the end of the session, and it was not completed. In 1965, the House-Senate conference altered it so much as to leave only a small fraction of the intended improvement.

This is the bill which for the first time would provide for social security purposes a statutory definition of blindness identical to that in common use and incorporated in the Internal Revenue Code. It would specify that any person meeting the statutory definition is automatically to be considered as disabled for purposes of social security benefits. It would also reduce the standard which requires 20 quarters of covered employment out of the last 40 to a standard of six quarters of covered employment.

It is my hope and expectation that this amendment will this year become a part of the social security law as enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 366) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 367

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], I send to the desk an amendment to the instructions of the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendment printed?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 368

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2388) to provide and improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2426) to provide certain essential assistance to the U.S. fisheries industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2411) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the amount of groundfish imported into the United States shall not exceed the average annual amount thereof imported during 1963 and 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 54) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON FRANCHISE COMPETITIVE PRACTICE ACT OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will hold hearings on S. 2321, the Franchise Competitive Practice Act of 1967, on October 10, 11, 13, 16, and 17, 1967.

I am advised by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and I am authorized by him to say that anyone interested in offering testimony on this proposal should contact Charles E. Bangert, assistant counsel, Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, room 414, Old Senate Office Building.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

Table entitled "Federal, State, and local social welfare expenditures—in billions of dollars for selected fiscal years 1940-66."

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Article entitled "Blue Bonnets: Texas Blooms Brighten Viet," published in the Austin (Tex.) American-Statesman, of September 16, 1967.

CONSENSUS ON THE BOMBING

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from today's New

York Times titled "Consensus on the Bombing." The editorial reports the fact that the representatives of nation after nation engaging in the general debate in the General Assembly of the United Nations have stated that the cessation of bombing of North Vietnam is the first step toward the possibility of negotiation. Canadian External Affairs Minister Paul Martin said in a speech:

It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped.

This is the point I have been arguing in the Senate for 2 years. In speeches in the Senate in January 1966, May 15, 1967, and July 27, 1967, I made the point that a first step—first concession—must be made by the United States. It is my view, as I have stated so often, that negotiations or any chance for action in the U.N., as has been so strongly urged by Senator MANSFIELD, cannot be guaranteed, but clearly are conditioned upon the cessation of bombing.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSENSUS ON THE BOMBING

On the eve of the opening of the current session of the United Nations General Assembly, Secretary General U Thant again urged that the United States stop bombing North Vietnam as an essential first step toward peace. Mr. Thant said he was "convinced" that if the bombing ended unconditionally, peace talks could begin in three or four weeks.

Concurrently, Agence France-Presse reported from Hanoi that "reliable sources" had indicated talks could begin between Hanoi and Washington within three or four weeks of a bombing halt.

The appeal for a bombing halt was taken up in the General Assembly Wednesday by Canada, one of America's closest friends and a nation that has had recent diplomatic contact with North Vietnam.

"There is not the slightest doubt in my mind," Canadian External Affairs Minister Paul Martin said, "that the first step in [the direction of talks] will involve the question of the bombing of North Vietnam. It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped. This is a matter of first priority if we are to start the process of de-escalation and open the door of the conference room."

Canada's plea has been echoed at this session of the United Nations so far in speeches by the representatives of Denmark, Sweden, France, Somalia, Indonesia and Kenya. Many other delegates, friends as well as opponents of American policy, have privately voiced similar views. This mounting international consensus favoring a U.S. initiative for peace through a bombing halt has its counterpart at home. An increasing number of Senators and Congressmen are calling for such a step, responding to the groundswell of public sentiment for an end to the war.

No one can guarantee that stopping the bombing will produce negotiations. There would be, as Mr. Thant has freely conceded, a "limited risk" in any such American initiative. But the United States is big enough to venture such a risk. And the risk is worth taking, especially in view of the limited effectiveness of the bombing, as acknowledged by the Secretary of Defense, and in light of the alternative risks involved in continued escalation of the war.

The Administration has repeatedly protested its desire for peace. Now is the time to prove this intention by heeding the ad-

vice of close friends and the wider world community. As Danish Premier Jens Otto Krag observed the other day: "He who takes the decisive step by which to bring the fighting to an end, to get negotiations started, and to insure durable peace in Southeast Asia will inscribe his name in the books of history."

A FANTASTIC PROPOSAL THAT SHOULD BE REJECTED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the action of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives yesterday in approving a proposed constitutional amendment to entitle the District of Columbia to two U.S. Senators and as many Representatives as it would have if it were a State—two, by current standards—does violence to the Constitution of the United States and, in my opinion, constitutes a distinct disservice to the residents of the District of Columbia.

The Constitution of the United States provides that:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State . . .

The Senate Chamber in which we meet was for many, many years termed the Hall of the States. In fact, this small rectangular chamber is truly the Hall of the States and should remain so, as the Founding Fathers envisaged it would. It is fantastic that a proposal should now be advanced and considered seriously in the other body to change the entire character of the Senate of the United States by the addition of two Senators representing a city, Washington, D.C., occupying an area of less than 10 square miles, the District of Columbia.

Washington is the Federal City. The District of Columbia is not a State. It is a very special district. When it was founded in accordance with article I, section 8 of the Constitution, it was never anticipated that the seat of Government of the United States would become a State. The Founding Fathers specifically provided that—

Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district . . . as may, by cession of particular states . . . become the seat of the government of the United States . . .

This has been part of the basic law of our Nation for 178 years. Those who have made the District of Columbia their home were well aware of, or should have been aware of, the fact that the District of Columbia is a unique governmental entity.

The action of the House Judiciary Committee radically altered a proposed constitutional amendment to give the District of Columbia a voting delegate in the House of Representatives. While I personally favor a nonvoting delegate for the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives, reasonable argument could be made for a voting delegate from the District of Columbia in the other body. The proposed amendment providing for accomplishing that stood a reasonable chance of obtaining a two-thirds vote of both houses of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States.

However, by elevating the District of Columbia to the status of a sovereign State with two U.S. Senators, the House Judiciary Committee virtually assured that this proposed constitutional amendment would not receive the required number of votes in the Congress and certainly would not be ratified by the requisite number of State legislatures. It is safe to say that this proposed amendment is assured of defeat. It is as dead as the dodo. Whereas, prior to the vote yesterday, residents of the District of Columbia did have some chance of receiving representation in the House of Representatives; they now stand no chance at all.

Mr. President, the proposed constitutional amendments go too far, indeed. The Federal City, Washington, D.C., is not entitled to two U.S. Senators. Very definitely, should this fantastic proposal be submitted to the Senate for debate and vote as a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, I will oppose it utterly and uncompromisingly. To me it seems absolutely unthinkable that such a proposal to amend our Constitution could be seriously considered in either body of Congress or in the legislatures of our States.

URBAN AMERICA: GOALS AND PROBLEMS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], has been charting most important and valuable fields in the economy of our country. Of the many fine activities this committee has undertaken, I should like to call the attention of Senators to a compendium of articles entitled "Urban America: Goals and Problems," compiled and prepared for the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs, under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished Representative from Missouri, Mr. BOLLING, and prepared by the director of research, Mr. James W. Knowles.

I have read these articles with great care. I respectfully suggest that any Member of this body or any other person who is concerned about the future of urban America cannot really be knowledgeable in this field without having examined and read very carefully the compendium of articles prepared for the subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend our distinguished chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], and his entire staff for having performed a valuable public service.

The Subcommittee on Urban Affairs at present is conducting a series of hearings which go into depth on many of these problems. I am sure that the work of this subcommittee and the hearings it is conducting will be a landmark for the future direction of urban America.

I suggest that members of the executive branch, as well as Members of Congress, pay the most careful attention to the articles in the subcommittee's publication and to the hearings now being conducted.

dial personnel burgeoning—and tuition costs soaring.

No end to the boom is in sight.

Today, six million young Americans are enrolled in institutions of higher education, about two-thirds in public and one-third in private schools. This is nearly twice as many as 10 years ago and nearly three times as many as 20 years ago.

The number can only go on multiplying as the belief takes hold that a college education is not the privilege of a minority but the right of everyone capable of benefiting from it—indeed that nearly universal higher education is a necessity if the nation is to remain a leader in a shrinking world run by technology.

Yet few people realize that Americans are collectively spending \$20 billion a year educating these six million students. Juan T. Trippe chairman of Pan American World Airways recently pointed out.

By contrast he said, England, with a quarter of the U.S. population, has but a 30th as many collegians—200,000—and spends but a 28th as much on their education—\$700 million.

Fully half this \$20 billion comes from private sources—endowments, tuition, alumni contributions, corporate gifts and foundation grants.

Another \$5 billion is allocated by state legislatures.

Federal financial support makes up the balance reaching a new high \$5 billion last year—25 times more than it was after World War II when federal participation in higher education began.

The outlook is for federal spending to more than triple in the coming decade as private and state sources reach their limit.

We talk a lot about "commitments" these days. We have commitments to our allies, commitments to South Vietnam, commitments to land on the moon, commitments to elevate the impoverished and discriminated-against in our own land.

But nowhere have Americans undertaken a commitment as willingly and enthusiastically as the one they have made to themselves and their children in the field of higher education.

THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS: ITS FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, one of the important private organizations contributing immensely valuable assistance to underdeveloped countries is the International Executive Service Corps. Since its inauguration on June 14, 1964, in a launching which included a White House ceremony some of us in this body attended, it has quietly and very soundly gone about the business of providing managerial aid to mainly private businesses in other countries. The American know-how provided by the volunteers whom the IESC has so carefully selected is helping to fill a great need.

One of the clearest, and certainly from many standpoints one of the most official, statements of its evolution and principles, its program and achievement, was made some months ago at an international management congress, sponsored by the Conseil International pour l'Organisation Scientifique—CIOS—by Mr. States Mead, vice president of the Chase Manhattan Bank. Mr. Mead was one who worked closely toward the formation of the IESC and has since been a member of its Board and Executive Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that his report to the CIOS meeting, held at Rotterdam, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[The CIOS XIV Congress, Rotterdam, Sept. 20, 1966]

THE FORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS

(By States M. Mead)

In September 1963 at the CIOS XIII International Management Congress in New York, Mr. David Rockefeller, President of the Chase Manhattan Bank, delivered the keynote address on the subject of "Managerial Work and Human Progress". In that address Mr. Rockefeller proposed the creation of a "Managerial Task Force of Free Enterprise", to be made up of businessmen-volunteers from the advanced nations who would serve as advisers or consultants to enterprises in the emerging nations in order to assist the growth or strong and free economies.

The proposal won a warm response, from both the immediate audience and others in both government and private circles. However, as we all know, much lies between ideas or words, on the one hand, and action and accomplishment, on the other hand. It is for that reason that I am both delighted and privileged to be able to report, just three years after Mr. Rockefeller's address, that the idea has borne fruit. Thanks to the attention and efforts of a number of responsible business and government leaders following the CIOS XIII Congress the International Executive Service Corps has been brought into existence, and is a going concern. To date, it has accepted nearly 300 individual projects in 33 countries of the developing nations and has completed one-third of them. It has assembled a remarkable roster of experienced American executives available for such assignment. And in the projects thus far completed, the IESC has proved that the concepts on which it was developed are sound and workable.

Besides Mr. Rockefeller, two individuals who must receive credit as "founding fathers" of the IESC, are U.S. Senators Vance Hartke of Indiana and Jacob Javits of New York. Senator Hartke, following a trip abroad in 1962 had proposed the establishment of a "businessman's peace corps" to make available to developing economies the talent and know-how of retired American business executives. Senator Javits had called on U.S. corporations to create a pool of skills for overseas assistance. What these proposals and Mr. Rockefeller's had in common was that the experts to be sent abroad would come from the private sector.

It so happened that this line of thought paralleled one that was being discussed within the Federal Administration, particularly in the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.): Could not the private sector be encouraged to play a larger role in the continuing United States program of economic aid to the developing nations?

In response to the very favorable reaction and a deluge of mail which followed Mr. David Rockefeller's CIOS XIII keynote address, he subsequently had a staff study made for the purpose of putting some meat on the skeleton of his basic idea.

A.I.D. also had undertaken some very thorough studies, based both upon various independent proposals and upon its own soundings of opinions and attitudes in the United States and abroad. The conclusion to which A.I.D. came was: that some sort of executive service corps could and should be established to make the human skills of U.S. business directly available to business in the developing nations. Hence, a small planning staff was created within A.I.D., and early in 1964 A.I.D. sponsored a voluntary organizing

conference of business leaders, both from companies and all major business associations and management groups, as well as from government. The conference participants, in turn, created an organizing committee which, significantly, was made up entirely of seven private businessmen, including Mr. David Rockefeller and Mr. Sol Linowitz of Xerox Corporation, as the organizing co-chairmen.

In the following two months, those seven men met frequently to plan and to direct the staff work necessary to develop a charter, select a suitable name, formulate basic policies, establish fundamental operating practices, elicit initial financial support, select and form a strong and highly representative Board of Directors. During this period valuable assistance was given by the Council for International Progress in Management (U.S.A.) and by the National Industrial Conference Board.

As the principal staff aide to the seven men of the Organizing Committee, I can bear witness to the intense interest, dedication and time they gave to the subject. In addition to Messrs. Rockefeller and Linowitz, these men were Mr. Ray R. Eppert, President of the Burroughs Corporation; Mr. Dan A. Kimball, Chairman of the Board of the Aerojet-General Corporation; Mr. William S. Paley, Chairman of the Board of the Columbia Broadcasting System; Mr. John H. Johnson, President of Johnson Publications; and the late Mr. C. D. Jackson, Senior Vice-President of Time Inc. We should note that Mr. Jackson was the General Program Chairman of CIOS XIII Congress and that he served as the first Chairman of the Board of Directors at the founding of the I.E.S.C.

By June 1964, the IESC had become a reality; incorporated as a non-profit organization in the New York State, with tax free status under United States law. Following the initial meeting of the IESC Board of Directors on June 14, 1964 the directors were received at the White House by President Johnson, who indicated his enthusiasm for the organization in saying: "You are making a most important contribution . . . to the economic development of the free world."

It was accepted at the outset that A.I.D. would provide initial grants, as "seed money", to help the IESC come into existence and grow—and that the contributions of the private sector would grow increasingly as a part of the total.

The recruitment of a small but very high grade initial headquarters organization required several months time—as also did the obtaining of suitable office space in New York City.

We were fortunate in convincing one of our IESC Directors to devote his services full time to the management of IESC as its President. This man is Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., a former Secretary of the Army and former President and Chairman of the General Dynamics Corp. In November 1964, the offices of IESC were opened in New York, and in January 1965, the first active project was initiated with the assignment of Mr. Howard Rose, a semi-retired consulting engineer of Connecticut to the Amado Engineering Co. in the small provincial city of David, Panama. Amado had asked for suggestions on problems encountered in growing from a small engineering firm into a metal fabricating and construction complex. Mr. Rose spent about four months there, recommended reorganization and personnel development and changes in pricing policies. The company subsequently benefitted much from the managerial assistance. Now, hardly 21 months later, there are 90 projects completed, 32 underway, 37 more to which the assigned volunteer is now en route, and over 120 for which a qualified executive is being recruited. By the end of this year it is expected that a total of about 400 projects will have been accepted since the beginning. It

is anticipated that in the future IESC will take on some 400 to 500 new projects each year.

Its activities already span the world—the length of Latin America and across Africa, the Middle East and Southern Asia to the Pacific. There are 80 projects in Central America, 43 in South America, 74 in the Far East, 72 in the Middle East, and now 10 in Africa with more anticipated.

In most cases, IESC projects consist of the assignment of a carefully selected executive to the top-management level of an overseas business firm. The program rests on two fundamental premises. One is that the service rendered must be of high quality. The other is that the enterprises assisted should be significant to the local economy.

Among other IESC principles are these:

1. The function of the IESC executive is only to help an enterprise, not to run it. Experience has shown that a three or four-month assignment is usually adequate, with a later follow-up assignment desired in some cases.

2. Although IESC is subsidized by public and private sources in the United States, overseas client firms must make a measurable contribution toward the cost of the services they receive. Such contributions are negotiated on the basis of local standards of compensation and the firm's ability to pay.

The principle of charging something for IESC service is basic. It is not a giveaway program. It is a business proposition among businessmen.

3. IESC provides service only where the necessary assistance cannot be obtained locally, either because of its cost or because it is not available.

4. IESC executives must be experienced businessmen, with records of substantial achievement, who volunteer to serve. They and the organizations they represent are interested in the opportunity to be of help rather than in salary or other material rewards.

IESC provides assistance principally to the private sector, but will consider any project that is likely to strengthen the local business community. In a few cases this includes assisting government agencies, when such assistance is likely to improve the environment for free enterprise.

The procedure for requesting IESC assistance is very simple. All that is necessary is for a firm to make its interest known to any of the IESC representatives now stationed in key countries around the developing world, or write directly to IESC in New York. It is not necessary to go through any official channel, although economic offices of both local governments and United States missions are ready to help establish contact with IESC when asked to do so.

After a proposed project is approved by the IESC field representative, it is submitted to New York for final approval. When this is given, IESC then—and only then—looks for the executive who can best do the job. For this is not an employment agency trying to turn up jobs for businessmen at loose ends; the client firm comes first. Although there have been thousands of inquiries from United States businessmen willing to volunteer for the program, IESC has firmly pruned this list down to fewer than 1,500 names of men considered qualified for overseas assignment. Even so, the file often does not yield the name of just the right man. When this happens, a specific search is made throughout the country to find him. IESC has a substantial recruiting office in New York (now manned by one paid and six volunteer recruiting officers) and a network of volunteer representatives in some 35 cities to assist the search. To date IESC has been very successful in matching the clients' needs with executives who are not only technically qualified but, equally important, are suited by personality and temperament to

adjust to working conditions that may be quite different from those they are used to.

Many of these men have recently retired from United States firms. Others have their own businesses, in which they are now freed of day-to-day responsibilities. Still others may be what are called "mid-career" men, executives still actively at work who are loaned to IESC for a few months by their U.S. employers.

All of them have one thing in common—they are volunteers. They serve IESC without compensation, except for basic expenses. This requirement that executives serve without salary is perhaps the most important single factor in assuring the quality of the service; it automatically weeds out the self-seeker.

Of the approximately 75 men who have so far completed more than 90 assignments (some have already gone out twice), nearly every one has said that the experience, and the opportunity to give of himself, has been one of the most satisfying episodes of his life. From the viewpoint of the client companies, it is of more significance that they, too, have found the association satisfying and rewarding.

There have inevitably been a few cases—but only a few—where personal or business problems have created serious obstacles; IESC considers seven or eight projects so far to have been unsuccessful, or a little less than one in ten. Thus the goal which President Frank Pace set—90 per cent success—is being met.

Approximately two-thirds of IESC's initial financial requirements have been met by grants from the U.S. Government and one-third by contributions from the private sector. The Government's participation reflects the continuing interest of the President of the United States in encouraging American business to assist foreign economic development. The private contributions reflect support for the IESC concept by the business community at home and abroad. It is important to note that the governmental grants to IESC through A.I.D., have been strictly with "no strings attached". Policy and programs are directed only by the IESC Board of Directors.

In this brief outline of the origins and progress of IESC we can detect a characteristic that is still today one of the most significant features of the program. It is a private effort, publicly sponsored. IESC's Board of Directors continues to be made up entirely of distinguished private businessmen.

It has 55 members, including some from various industries and regions and few outstanding figures from major business schools. Initial members of the IESC Board of Directors have been the outgoing President of CIOs, Mr. Gerrit van der Wal of the Netherlands, and his predecessor, Mr. A. M. Lederer of the United States. The Board meets twice a year, and its Executive Committee of 15 members meets 4 times a year to review management. The IESC budget continues to be assisted by A.I.D. contributions.

In this respect IESC has become an unusual, if not unique, experiment. Its sponsors like to think that after too many years in which the public sector and the private sector looked upon each other as natural enemies, they are helping to clear a path toward the fruitful collaboration.

IESC's special blend of private and public effort carries over from the United States to the countries where it engages in active projects. The executive advisers assigned to overseas firms are strictly private individuals, but they function with the full knowledge and approval of the local government, which normally enters into a simple agreement with IESC regulating such matters as the tax status of the executive volunteer. Similarly, the client companies to which these volunteers are assigned, for periods of

three or four or six months, are private enterprises, almost without exception. One exception for example, is in Ghana where an IESC volunteer, a public-utility executive from Columbus, Ohio, is now helping that troubled country to unscramble the economic omelet dished up by its former government. IESC was one of the first Western agencies Ghana turned to in its effort to chart a new course for the future. IESC projects are broadly conceived in terms of the economic future of the country as a whole. Still others, far more numerous, are more limited in scope but collectively no less significant. There are volunteers working on management and technical problems with individual firms throughout almost the entire range of business activity. As the total number of projects multiplies in such fields as these, IESC hopes also for a multiplying effect on economic growth and international cooperation.

Now let me recall that the various suggestions which gave birth to the IESC varied greatly in detail. They had in common, however, the general observation that large scale government-to-government aid lacked two important elements as a stimulus to the growth of vigorous free economies in the developing nations. In the first place, it did not provide sufficient opportunity for the private sector in American life to participate directly in the creation of a strong private sector overseas.

In the second place, massive injections of funds to close the capital gap between the developed and the developing nations did not alleviate what has been called the second gap—namely, the discrepancy in human skills, and primarily managerial knowledge and skills.

The developing nations simply do not have the vast resources of managerial talent and experience that have been such vital factors in our dynamic American economy.

Thus, the IESC concept is one of growth through international cooperation, very much in keeping with our topic here today at CIOs XIII. Although initiated primarily through American stimulus and action, it does not exclude the participation of the businessmen of other advanced nations, who share an interest in the objectives of IESC.

I believe the establishment and progress of the International Executive Service Corps, in these three short years since our last CIOs Congress, is a tribute both to the international spirit and dedication to management science (which is exemplified by CIOs) and to the generous, practical efforts of the IESC founders. IESC is both a successful experiment and a reality—in cooperation between the U.S. Government and private enterprise and in international cooperation for growth and economic development through better management. I am confident that by the time of the next CIOs Congress in 1969, this cooperation will have been carried still further.

WHY ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM HAS TROUBLE IN CONGRESS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during this debate on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, it is timely indeed to heed the counsel of those individuals who are on the "front line" of the "war on poverty," the mayors of our Nation's great cities.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued on September 25 by Hon. Joseph A. Doorley, Jr., mayor of Providence, R.I., in which he discusses the true reasons why the antipoverty program has had such trouble in Congress.

Mayor Doorley has compiled one of the most successful records of any municipal chief executive in the Nation, and I know that Senators will want to give his views careful attention.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MAYOR JOSEPH A. DOORLEY, JR.,
PROVIDENCE, R.I., SEPTEMBER 25, 1967

The city has formulated and is now operating one of the most comprehensive programs in the Nation to combat poverty. We provide legal services, educational programs, consumer assistance, employment aid, and a host of other projects which are giving the alienated poor an opportunity which they never have shared before.

The war on poverty is not an effort simply to support people or to make them dependent upon the generosity of others; it is designed to give the poor a chance to help themselves. Our program in Providence has made it possible for thousands of inner city inhabitants to secure a chance and an opportunity to rejoin the mainstream of American life and share in its affluence and prosperity.

Today's *Providence Journal* on page 28 reports that the anti-poverty bill pending in Congress is in trouble. And that trouble stems from Republican opposition to the bill.

Not too many days ago, the Policy Committee of the Republican Governors' Conference met in New York at the request of Governor Rockefeller. They discussed means of relaxing tension in the Nation's racial ghettos. Their report charged that the Federal government had failed to allot sufficient funds for its programs dealing with urban poverty.

It is ironic that the Republican governors have so little influence over their Congressional representatives. It is also ironic that the Republican Party which only last August called for more aid to eliminate urban poverty now, one month later, is about to destroy the hope and aspiration of all the Nation's ghetto dwellers.

The politically motivated utterances of the Governors' Policy Committee show clearly that the Republicans are more interested in developing a national candidate than they are in helping the impoverished people of the Nation's cities.

The people of this city and those of every other city should marshal their resources in protest to the politically inspired conduct of the Republicans in Congress who are about to destroy this important program.

ANOTHER FAMOUS MARINE CORPS GENERAL SPEAKS OUT AGAINST U.S. MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, there has been for too long a mistaken impression in the country that all military men are in favor of the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

This is not so.

More and more experienced military men are speaking out against U.S. military involvement.

I have previously alluded to the fact that Gen. Douglas MacArthur, undoubtedly one of the greatest soldiers of our time, warned repeatedly against engaging in a ground war on the continent of Asia. He said:

Anyone in favor of sending American ground troops to fight on Chinese soil should have his head examined.

Gen. Matthew Ridgway and Gen. Omar Bradley also warned against such action. Gen. David M. Shoup, retired Command-

ant of the U.S. Marine Corps, in addressing the annual Junior College World Affairs Convention in Los Angeles in May, 1966, said:

I want to tell you I don't think the whole of Southeast Asia, as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the people of this country, is worth the life or limb of a single American.

To this respectable chorus of experienced military men warning against U.S. military involvement in a land war in Asia, there is now added the voice of a distinguished former Marine Corps officer, Samuel D. Griffith II, retired brigadier general of the Marine Corps—who, in a message to the Business Executives for Peace in Vietnam, meeting on September 27, 1967, said, in part:

If we really want negotiation, we must begin to de-escalate the war rather than continue to escalate . . . Even if we were to obliterate North Vietnam completely, the guerrilla war in the South could continue. . . . Why is it not possible for America, the most powerful nation in the world, to take a first step toward what practically everybody in the world except Mao Tse Tung wants?

General Griffith is a China scholar as well as a much decorated Marine officer. Guerrilla warfare is not unknown to him. In World War II, he commanded the 1st Marine Raiders, winning the Navy Cross and the Purple Heart at Guadalcanal and the Army Distinguished Cross at New Georgia. After his retirement in 1956, General Griffith earned a Ph. D. in Chinese military history at Oxford. He translated Mao Tse-tung's "On Guerrilla Warfare" and, more recently, wrote "The Battle for Guadalcanal." He is a research fellow on China studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City and is a member of the Institute for Strategic Studies in London.

As a student of Chinese military history, he said:

Our country . . . is now beginning to be hurt both in body and spirit. And who stands to reap the benefits of our misguided strategy? None other than Moscow and Peking.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the message sent by General Griffith to the Business Executive for Peace in Vietnam, meeting on September 27, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE TO HENRY E. NILES, COCHAIRMAN,
BUSINESS EXECUTIVES FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM,
BALTIMORE, MD.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1967.

DEAR MR. NILES: I regret that my scheduled trip to the Far East makes it impossible for me to attend the Washington Meeting of Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace.

I heartily endorse the objectives of your organization so clearly set forth in your Open Letter to the President printed in the New York Times on May 28, 1967.

Mr. Chairman, our country is indeed troubled. American casualties in the Vietnam War are increasing at an alarming rate. In one three-day period last week more than 400 U.S. Marines were killed or wounded at Con Thien, a position on the border of the so-called demilitarized zone in Vietnam. There the Viet Cong used artillery, heavy mortars, and rockets. This bombardment was no isolated incident but the scale of it is a grim portent of the future. It is high time

for the American people to ask bluntly, "For what purpose are Americans still being killed and maimed in Vietnam?" We, of course, know the official answers to this question. We have heard them countless times but the situation today requires something more than the tired clichés of the Secretary of State.

What is imperatively demanded is a positive policy designed to end the fighting in Vietnam so that those unhappy people who have not known peace for two decades may once again enjoy it and so that we may stop expending lives, blood, energy, and resources in an area which is not of critical importance either to our national security or to our strategic position in the Far East.

Despite optimistic statements to the contrary, the end of the Vietnam War is not yet in sight. Indeed, the chances for a peaceful settlement grow daily more remote as the Administration stubbornly persists in its desperate determination to force Ho Chi Minh to negotiate. Let us ask whether further Americanization of the war and its progressive escalation toward a confrontation with China is the way to persuade Hanoi to talk peace. This is, however, precisely the policy which the Administration pursues. It is, in my opinion, as I believe it is in yours, a disastrous policy.

If we really want negotiation, we must begin to de-escalate the war rather than continue to escalate. The obvious action we can take, and I believe should take and at once, is to cease bombing Hanoi. Even were we to obliterate North Vietnam completely, the guerrilla war in the South would continue.

Our bombing of the North does not and cannot, as Mr. McNamara has testified, stop the flow of the relatively small tonnage required to sustain guerrilla war in South Vietnam.

Why is it not possible for America, the most powerful nation in the world, to take a first step toward what practically everybody in the world except Mao Tse Tung wants?

If a strategy proves unproductive, it is the first responsibility of a commander to change it. But how long are we going to have to wait?

How long would a business man wait to change a manifestly wrong policy? Not long, or he would soon be out of business. I am not suggesting that our country is going out of business, but it is now beginning to be hurt both in body and in spirit. And, who stands to reap the benefits of our misguided strategy? None other than Moscow and Peking.

Surely respect for our President both at home and abroad would not diminish should he take a first positive step which, hopefully, could lead us eventually out of this costly morass into which we daily sink deeper and deeper.

Finally, Sir, I want to congratulate you, Mr. Wilens, and your Executive Committee for organizing "Business Executives Move For Vietnam Peace" and again to express my regret that I cannot be with you.

Sincerely,

Brig. Gen. SAMUEL D. GRIFFITH II,
U.S. Marine Corps, Retired.

THE FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN MOTORS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, American Motors Corp., is in a most serious situation as it introduces its new models this year. When its books are tallied up for the fiscal year ending September 30, they may well show a loss of \$60,000,000 for the year, while it faces loans due December 31 in the staggering amount of \$66,600,000.

Yet the management is optimistic about changes now in process. With a current sale of only 3 percent of all cars,

leaving dealer showrooms, American Motors is aiming at 4.2 percent of sales by next summer. In a field where most of the business is shared by only three companies, the American economy needs the preservation of this smaller company lest the monopolistic trend toward fewer companies—a trend not confined to the automobile field—be accentuated still further.

On August 11 the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] introduced a bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, dealing with the tax situation of this company. I am a cosponsor of the bill.

An enlightening article detailing this company's situation, in the form of a Detroit dispatch, was published in the National Observer of September 25. Mr. Roy Chapin, as American's chairman and chief executive officer since early this year, and his team of executives are moving positively to cope with the situation, as the article shows. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN MOTORS: "WE'VE QUIT RAMBLING"—SHIFTING FOR AN UPHILL CLIMB

DETROIT.—This is American Motors Corp.'s week of hope and horror.

The company hopes for the beginning of a 20 per cent annual sales gain when the 1968 models go on sale Sept. 26 with a flashy new advertising campaign for a flashy new car, the Javelin, AMC's first entry in the "Mustang market." But the company still shudders at the red ink splashed so freely through AMC's ledger for its fiscal year ending Sept. 30.

Indeed, this loss, which may reach \$60,000,000, forces the question of whether AMC can survive. If it does, its recovery will have to be splendid as its decline was calamitous, because its 1967 loss approaches some of the most spectacular deficits in recent business history—General Dynamics Corp.'s \$69,437,000 loss in 1961 and the \$76,932,000 loss in 1965 by Brunswick Corp.

These companies quickly rebounded into profits. Brunswick's loss came primarily from a onetime write-off when the company overextended its bowling investments. General Dynamics abandoned in 1962 its production of Convair 880 and 990 jets, which had drained its treasury. AMC's potential recovery appears tougher.

AMC, for example, can't drop autos; its only other business is the lagging Kelvinator appliance division, which accounts for 12 to 14 per cent of the company's sales. AMC must sell more cars. A legacy of questionable management decisions helped cut domestic sales during the 1967 model year to about 243,000 cars from 441,472 in 1963. And bankers may press AMC for the \$66,500,000 due Dec. 31 and secured by mortgages on the company's plants, equipment, and inventories.

At AMC's headquarters on Plymouth Road here, management bubbles with determination. The word "survival" has been stricken from the accepted corporate lexicon. Ask William V. Luneburg, the peppery American Motors' president, if the company can be saved, and he snarls: "What the hell do you think I'm doing here? This outfit isn't planning on optimism."

RECOVERY PROGRAM OUTLINED

Roy D. Chapin, Jr., AMC's chairman and chief executive officer since January, last spring outlined a recovery plan to the 24 creditor banks, with month by month projections on sales and costs. "We're right where we said we would be," he declares now. "They [the banks] are in a more positive

frame of mind. I'm confident we can live up to our commitments until next June."

Mr. Chapin won't specify that June goal, but a vice president suggests AMC will grab 4.2 per cent of the auto market by next summer; it currently makes 3 of every 100 cars sold in the nation.

Such optimism has encouraged some investors. No large institutional investors a few months ago owned any of AMC's 19,000,000 common shares. AMC now proudly declares that mutual funds own 3,000,000 of the company's shares; its stock closed last week at \$15.13 a share, compared with a 1966 low of \$6.38.

"I've been through a lot of mock burials before, and we've always recovered," chuckles one top AMC official. American Motors was created in 1954 by merging two dying companies, Nash-Kelvinator Co. and Hudson Motor Co. The financial hemorrhage continued. In 1956 the company lost \$30,000,000, and AMC was selling less than 2 per cent of the nation's cars. Then came economic recession, and boom times for AMC's little car. AMC in 1959 turned a \$60,000,000 profit. Sales the following year reached 7.2 per cent of the market.

This success had a side effect; it lured George Romney into politics in 1962. For a successor as AMC president, Mr. Romney tapped Roy Abernethy, his bluff, cigar-smoking sales chief. The Abernethy management posted profit gains in 1962 and 1963. As competition tightened the compact market, Mr. Abernethy decided to expand AMC's market; he called it "moving the fence" within which AMC operated.

The company jazzed up its cars, adding inches, horsepower, options, and cost. "We've got everything everyone else has," Mr. Abernethy boasted. Laments an insider: "The proliferating number of body styles and frequent changes in models created tremendous costs of tooling. If they had sparked adequate volume, fine, but they didn't. At least our old boxy compact was distinctive." After a \$37,800,000 profit in 1963, profits and sales tailed off steadily, until AMC lost \$12,600,000 in fiscal 1966, and ran a \$47,985,000 loss in the first nine months of this fiscal year.

The mistakes ran deeper than styling. AMC paid generous cash dividends to shareholders. From 1961 through 1966 the company accumulated a profit equal to \$6.97 per share of its common stock, and paid out dividends of \$4.71 a share, or 69 per cent of its profit. By comparison Ford Motor Co. over the same five-year period paid less than 40 per cent of its profit in dividends, saving the rest for expansion, modernization, and other expenses.

Then auto buyers discovered the Mustang. To get in on the market for small, sporty cars, AMC decided to build, beginning in 1965, a car it called the Marlin. One insider on reflection concedes AMC should never have built this car, which was planned as a sporty version of its American series. The American was the smallest of AMC's three model lines, which included the Classic (now called Rebel), and the top-of-the-line Ambassador. But to give Marlin plenty of power and zip, AMC decided to equip it with a V-8 engine. "The V-8 engine didn't fit the American chassis, so we put the Marlin on a Classic chassis. That made the car too big to sell well," this official admits. Before it was dropped earlier this year, Marlin reached a top selling pace of 1,000 a month.

In search of cash, AMC mortgaged its plants and equipment, then spent \$60,000,000 to re-style the 1967-model cars. Mr. Abernethy predicted domestic sales of 375,000 AMC cars, up from 280,000 in the 1966 model run. When the sales slump continued, AMC directors eased Mr. Abernethy aside last January.

The shift brought a sharp personality change in the corporate management. Mr. Abernethy came up through sales, and he seemed to feel most at home with dealers. Mr. Chapin prefers, as now he must, bankers.

Thin, articulate, patrician, and wealthy, Mr. Chapin chats easily and confidently of AMC recovery. As a sign of where the company's problems lie, only 2 of 15 vice presidents report to Mr. Chapin directly: the vice presidents for public relations and finance.

AN EXPENSIVE SHUTDOWN

With a 150-day stock of unsold cars, the Chapin-Luneburg management shut down production early this year for several weeks at the AMC assembly plant in Kenosha, Wis. Mr. Chapin talks of the shutdown as "excruciating," and its cost at running into the "tens of millions of dollars."

Then, to boost sales, AMC cut the suggested retail price by \$234 to \$1,839 on its lowest-priced American model; about half the cut was in the wholesale price to the dealer, the remainder in the dealer's suggested mark-up. In April, AMC sold 7,400 Americans, compared with 3,200 in January. AMC blames a shortage of cars for the drop in sales of the American last month to 4,255, off from a year-earlier 6,740.

The company trimmed costs, reducing the number of salaried employees to a current 7,000 from nearly 8,400 at the end of 1966. It dropped "marginal" development work on a rotary engine.

AMC seeks to refashion its image. "We've quit rambling," declares a vice president. "With a name like Rambler, you can't have a sharp company." So the name Rambler now appears only on the American series, and the company has begun a program to help dealers pay for new "American Motors" signs to replace "Rambler" signs. The company hired the Wells, Rich, Greene, Inc., advertising agency to add zip to its advertising. The campaign, which concentrates on the Javelin, includes one TV pitch showing six gangsters stealing a Javelin for a get-away car because its got such a big engine and so much back-seat leg room.

Doubt persists among many business analysts over a very basic question: whether Mr. Chapin has the necessary freedom and time to accomplish his goals. AMC last May sold its Redisco, Inc., financial subsidiary to Chrysler Corp. for a fire-sale price of around \$28,500,000, sustaining a \$5,289,178 loss on the transaction. Says a Wall Street analyst: "They sold a property earning a profit of \$3,000,000 yearly to pay off part of their loan and reduce their annual debt costs by maybe \$1,500,000 a year. That sounds to me like the creditors are running the company, and running it to their benefit."

Mr. Chapin denies this. "The bankers are trying to be as helpful as they can. David Rockefeller [president of Chase Manhattan Bank, the key lender] made a TV tape for our dealer show. He didn't have to spend time doing that. He feels a desire to see us succeed. Everybody in the country wants us to make it." Ford and General Motors Corp. have opened their safety-testing facilities for AMC use. GM is selling AMC a new, collapsible steering column. "They made it available to us immediately. They didn't have to."

Good wishes don't sell cars. Javelin may accomplish that. Mr. Chapin plots this formula for AMC success in 1968: Sell as many Americans, Rebels, and Ambassadors as during the 1967 model run, 243,000, then top that with 60,000 Javelins. But with an uncertain economic year ahead and only a "light face-lift" in styling of its non-Javelin models, holding at 1967 levels may not come easily.

And will buyers take to a car that seems a me-too copy of Ford's Mustang? Granted, there are differences, such as two extra inches of rear-seat leg room, compared with Mustang, three added gallons of gas-tank capacity, and a plastic grille.

"You don't have to offer radical differences," Mr. Chapin believes. "You just must give people a reason to buy, a reason to say why they bought an American Motors car." Leg space is a big Javelin difference. Price is

GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-68

[P denotes prospective teachers; e experienced]

State and Institution	Program	Number of awards	State and Institution	Program	Number of awards
Alabama: University of Alabama	Elementary education	4-p	Maine: University of Maine	Elementary and secondary education	4-p
Alaska: University of Alaska	Biology	4-p		Guidance	20-e
	Rural education	25-e	Maryland:		
Arizona:			Johns Hopkins University	English, math, social sciences, science, modern foreign languages	12-p
Arizona State University	English math	10-p		History	15-e
	Art	25-e	University of Maryland	Teaching, guidance	25-e
	English	15-e	Massachusetts:		
University of Arizona	Reading	25-e	Boston College	Elementary education	4-p
Arkansas:			Boston University	Chemistry	4-p
Henderson State Teachers College	History	4-p	Clark University	Geography	4-p
University of Arkansas	do.	4-p		Geography, history	20-e
	Modern foreign languages	15-e	Harvard University	English, reading, math, art, music, science, social studies, foreign languages	16-p
California:				Physical education	4-p
California State College, Los Angeles	Social studies education	4-p	Springfield College	Early elementary education, French	8-p
Chapman College	Modern media	25-e	Tufts University	English	4-p
Claremont Graduate School	Elementary education	4-p	University of Massachusetts, Amherst		
Sacramento State College	English	4-p			
San Fernando Valley State College	do.	25-e	Michigan:		
San Francisco State College	Early elementary education	20-e	Eastern Michigan University	Early elementary education	4-p
Stanford University	Secondary education	16-p		Social studies curricula	20-e
	Elementary education	25-e	Maygrove College	Educational reading	4-p
University of California, Berkeley, Los Angeles	do.	4-p	Michigan State University	History, social science	10-p
University of Southern California	English	4-p		Reading, math, science	25-e
	Elementary education	4-p	University of Michigan	Music	4-p
Colorado:				Elementary education	24-e
Adams State College	Elementary and secondary education	4-p	Wayne State University	Business education	4-p
Colorado State University	Earth science, education reading, English	12-p		Industrial arts	24-e
University of Denver	Elementary and secondary education, international relations	10-p	Western Michigan University	International studies	4-p
	Elementary education	4-p	Minnesota:		
Western State College			University of Minnesota, Duluth	Science and math	24-e
Connecticut:			Minneapolis-St. Paul	Classics, guidance	8-p
University of Connecticut	Math	18-e		Geography, history	20-e
Wesleyan University	Secondary education	6-p	Mississippi: University of Mississippi	History	4-p
Yale University	do.	10-p		Reading	25-e
Delaware: University of Delaware	Math	4-p	Missouri:		
District of Columbia:			St. Louis University	Elementary and secondary education	4-p
Howard University	Elementary and secondary education	10-p	University of Missouri, Columbia	English	4-p
Trinity College	History education	4-p	Washington University	Elementary and secondary education language arts	12-p
Florida:					
Florida State University	Art, English, social science, foreign language	16-p	Montana: Montana State University	Elementary education	4-p
	Math	25-e	Nebraska: University of Nebraska	Elementary education, social science	8-p
	English	25-e	Nevada: University of Nevada	Elementary education	4-p
Stetson University	Social studies	4-p	New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire	Science	4-p
University of Florida	Chemistry and physics	4-p		Guidance, reading	25-e
	Spanish	15-e		Science	20-e
	Supervision	25-e	New Jersey:		
University of Miami	Mental retardation	4-p	Montclair State College	English	4-p
University of South Florida	Early elementary education	4-p	Rutgers, the State University	Romance languages	4-p
Georgia:				Psychology	30-e
Emory University	Secondary education	12-p	Seton Hall University	Elementary education, Japanese, Chinese	8-p
University of Georgia	Math, geography, history science and social science education	12-p	Trenton State College	Outdoor education	25-e
	Reading	25-e	New Mexico: New Mexico Highlands University	Mental retardation	4-p
	Psychology	20-e	New York:		
Hawaii: University of Hawaii	Science education	4-p	Colgate University	Science, English, math, social science, romance languages	4-p
	Communications	20-e			
Idaho: Idaho State University	English	4-p	Columbia University Teachers College	English	8-p
Illinois:				Early elementary education	25-e
Illinois Technical College Chicago, North	Language, arts, education	4-p		Math	15-e
	Disadvantaged	25-e	Fordham University	English, history	8-p
Northwestern University	Elementary education	4-p	Hofstra University	Early elementary education	4-p
Southern Illinois University	Curriculum supervisors, helping teachers, department chairmen	25-e		Elementary education	20-e
	Biology, English, math, foreign languages, physical and social science	16-p	New York University	Physical education, foreign language	12-p
	Urban elementary education	10-e		Disadvantaged-urban	18-e
University of Chicago	Latin, math, secondary education	16-p	SUNY College, Geneseo, Potsdam	English as 2d language	25-e
University of Illinois	Early elementary education	20-e		Physics and science	4-p
	English	20-e	Syracuse University	Chemistry	4-p
Indiana:				Educational media	15-e
Ball State University	English, physics	8-p		Social studies	24-e
DePauw University	Math	4-p		Reading	15-e
Indiana State University	Guidance	20-e	North Carolina:		
Indiana University	Biology, reading, math, classic literature, music, Russian	16-p	Appalachian State Teachers College	Math	4-p
	French, Spanish	25-e	Duke University	English, French	8-p
Purdue University	Secondary education	12-p	North Carolina College	Media specialists	16-e
	Economics	25-e	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	Elementary and secondary education	12-p
	Political science, civics	15-e	North Dakota: University of North Dakota	Social science	4-p
University of Notre Dame	Secondary education	4-p	Ohio:		
Valparaiso University	World history	20-e	Kent State University	English, geography	8-p
	Social science	4-p	Ohio State University	Art education	8-p
Iowa:			Ohio University	Speech	4-p
Clarke College	Reading	25-e		Economics	25-e
Drake University	Biology, elementary education	8-p	University of Dayton	English	4-p
Iowa State University of Science and Technology	Sex education	4-p	University of Toledo	Elementary and secondary education	4-p
State College of Iowa	Industrial arts education	4-p	Oklahoma:		
Kansas:			Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Sciences	English	4-p
Kansas State College, Pittsburg	English	4-p	University of Oklahoma	Math	4-p
Kansas State Teachers College	Secondary education	4-p	Oregon:		
University of Kansas	German, math, social sciences	12-p	Oregon College of Education	Geography	25-e
	History	15-e	Reed College	Secondary education	4-p
	Geography	20-e	University of Oregon	Elementary, secondary education, physical education, art, math, English	12-p
Kentucky: University of Kentucky	Elementary education	4-p		English	20-e
Louisiana:				Elementary education	15-e
Loyola University	Physical science	25-e	Pennsylvania:		
Southern University and A. & M. College	English	4-p	Carnegie Institute of Technology	English	4-p
University of Southwestern Louisiana	Computer science	15-e		History	15-e
			Pennsylvania State University	Sex education	6-p
				Geography	16-e
			Temple University	Disadvantaged-urban	25-e
			University of Pennsylvania	Elementary education	6-p

GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS UNDER THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-68—Continued

[P denotes prospective teachers; e experienced]

State and Institution	Program	Number of awards	State and Institution	Program	Number of awards
Rhode Island: Brown University.....	Secondary education.....	16-p	Utah:		
South Carolina: South Carolina State College.....	Elementary education.....	4-p	Brigham Young University.....	Physics, family life.....	8-p
South Dakota: University of South Dakota.....	English.....	4-p	Utah State University.....	Business education.....	4-p
Tennessee:				Social sciences.....	25-e
George Peabody College for Teachers.....	Music, social science, social studies education.....	12-p	Vermont:		
Memphis State University.....	Humanities.....	25-e	St. Michael's College.....	English.....	4-p
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University.....	Science teaching.....	4-p	University of Vermont.....	do.....	4-p
University of Tennessee, Knoxville.....	Home economics, health, physical education.....	8-p	Virginia:		
Vanderbilt University.....	Business education.....	4-p	College of William and Mary.....	Elementary education.....	4-p
Texas:	Secondary education.....	12-p	University of Virginia.....	Secondary education.....	8-p
North Texas State University.....	Elementary education.....	4-p	Washington:		
Sam Houston State College.....	Science.....	4-p	University of Washington.....	Music.....	4-p
	do.....	25-e		Germanics.....	25-e
Southern Methodist University.....	History.....	4-p	Western Washington State College.....	English, math.....	10-p
	do.....	25-e		English.....	16-e
Texas A. & M. University.....	History, science.....	10-p	West Virginia: West Virginia University.....	Music.....	4-p
Texas Christian University.....	English.....	4-p	Wisconsin:		
Texas Woman's University.....	Elementary education.....	4-p	Marquette University.....	Spanish.....	4-p
University of Houston.....	do.....	4-p	Wisconsin State University, River Falls, Platteville.....	Social science.....	4-p
University of Texas.....	Art, art education, music, physical education.....	12-p		Industrial arts.....	24-e
			Wyoming: University of Wyoming.....	Elementary education, physical.....	6-p
			Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico.....	English, social science, math.....	4-p

INCREASE TAXES OR CUT FEDERAL SPENDING?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, over the past few weeks an upsurge of interest in cutting Federal spending as an alternative to a tax increase has been very evident on Capitol Hill. I have gone on record as supporting this approach. Consequently, I was delighted to read an editorial in the San Jose, Calif., Mercury-News which stressed the need for a good hard look at Federal spending priorities with particular reference to Senator Proxmire's proposed legislation to create a Government Program Evaluation Commission.

Over the years, the Senator from Wisconsin has achieved a reputation for carefully examining Federal expenditure policy. Thus I think it is appropriate that he should be in the forefront of those who are espousing a cutback in Federal spending rather than a 10-percent surtax.

I ask unanimous consent that the Mercury-News editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROXMIRE'S REFORM IDEAS POPULAR WITH TAXPAYERS

Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis) is one of those on Capitol Hill who does not believe that the Johnson administration's proposed 10 per cent surcharge on corporate and individual income is a good idea.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, who is ranking majority member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and chairman of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, believes the surcharge will not reduce inflationary pressures, halt the price spiral or—for that matter—even produce as much revenue as the President hopes.

Senator Proxmire would rather see the federal government cut its spending programs than raise taxes, and, in this the gentleman from Wisconsin surely must echo the heartfelt sentiments of a majority of Americans.

In point of fact, Senator Proxmire has gone so far as to suggest specific areas in which budget cuts can be made—the space program post-Apollo, supersonic transport development and “pork barrel” public works projects to name but three.

This approach to the problem of federal spending, however, is hopelessly inadequate, Senator Proxmire concedes, because too many Americans believe that the federal government is so big, and the mechanics of it so cumbersome, that meaningful reductions in spending are impossible.

Senator Proxmire disagrees. What is needed, in his view, is a review of old federal programs, to see which should be retained and which jettisoned, and establishment of a set of national priorities that could guide Congress in establishing new programs.

To this end, Senator Proxmire has introduced S. 2032, which would establish a government commission to evaluate programs, both old and new with an eye to their cost effectiveness, and to ponder the question of national priorities.

In the Senator's words:

“The commission members would be appointed by the President, the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tem of the Senate, and would be required to report to the President and the Congress by Feb. 1, 1969. It is my great hope that this commission will be useful to the President, to the Congress, and, above all, to the people whose tax dollars pay for everything the federal government does....

With over 20 per cent of the national income passing through the federal till, federal expenditures are of major importance. The ways the federal government chooses to spend tax revenue has a tremendous effect on the allocation of our basic resources in this nation and upon our growth and prosperity as an economy.”

The point is a telling one. Senator Proxmire's colleagues in the Senate and in the House should support his program evaluation commission bill. It represents a step, and a significant one at that, toward a long-needed government reform.

AMENDMENT TO ADD GOVERNOR VETO PROVISIONS TO TITLE III(b) OF THE ANTIPOVERTY BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the response to the amendment proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] to add a provision which would allow the Governors to veto programs for migrant and farm workers under title III(b) of S. 2388 was immediate, spontaneous, and unanimously opposed to such an amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent to have printed in the RECORD 12 telegrams which are representative of the viewpoint expressed to me.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The problems of migrant workers cannot be solved on a State basis. A very large part of the self-help housing program in this country is among seasonal and migrant farm workers financed by OEO section III(b) funds. There is no Federal program we know of where there has been a finer cooperative working relationship between low income families local religious business and professional people and a Federal agency than in self-help housing. Consequently we are deeply concerned about any proposal which would inject a veto power between local groups and OEO. This program is so locally oriented that an official at a higher level might not be possessed of the requisite information to pass wise judgment on the validity of programs. The only State in which a self-help housing program has been dismantled was in a State OEO office. There is nothing in our experience to indicate that migrant programs would be improved by placing Federal funds under State control. Indeed the contrary is quite clear.

Sincerely,

CLAY L. COCHRAN,
Executive Director, International Self-Help Housing Association.

VISALIA, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Chairman, Subcommittee, Migratory Labor,
Senate Office Building, Washington,
D.C.

We strongly object to amendment title III-(b) OEO giving Governor veto power. Interstate of program makes this amendment impractical. An added bureaucratic factor will preclude benefits to low-income migrants.

EVERETT S. KRAKOV,
Executive Director, Tulare County Community Action Agency.

DES MOINES, Iowa,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

We desire maximum flexibility of operation under the various phases of the OEO

program and reiterate our strong opposition to any amendment which would give governors at the State level veto power over the application of funds whether public or private we urgently request defeat of the amendment introduced by Senator George Murphy.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE
CONFERENCE.
Msgr. EDWARD W. O'ROURKE,
Executive Director.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge voting down Murphy amendment to poverty bill giving veto power to governors of title III(b) programs would seriously endanger and delay some of the most effective and urgently needed programs to needy seasonal farm workers and their families.

FAY BENNETT,
Executive Secretary, National Advisory
Committee on Farm Labor.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON ARLINGTON WILLIAMS,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please oppose the Murphy amendment which would give Governors veto power over title III, part B of poverty bill. Proposed amendment would be a handicap for poorest rural people.

BEN M. HERBSTER,
President, United Church of Christ.

BALTIMORE, Md.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator Murphy's motion to subject title III of EOA to Governor's veto would emasculate or eliminate many title III projects.

SCOTT NIELSEN,
Director, Farm Labor Program South-
eastern Pennsylvania, American
Friends Service Committee, Kenneth
Square, Pa.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you do everything to prevent title III of the Economic Opportunity Act being subject to Governor's veto through title III innovative programs in many previously neglected areas have begun to find solutions and create a partnership in the use of public and private resources. Seasonal farm labor programs require multi-stage approach difficulty of securing for example approval of six or more east coast Governors staggers imagination. Possibility of veto and delays inevitably inherent in procedure would effectively minimize participation and contribution of private agencies to war on poverty. Present title III has enabled imaginative and conscientious use of anti-poverty resources in line with stated intent of original act.

ELEANOR A. EATON,
Community Relations Division, Ameri-
can Friends Service Committee.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Chamber of U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Feeling here in south Florida that Murphy amendment to section 3b of OEO bill can be terribly damaging to migrant programs

since many considerations expand beyond State boundaries.

EDWIN TUCKER,
Director, Diocese of Miami Office of
Community Service.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator PETE WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge against amendment placing 3b under Governor's veto.

Rev. D. W. HAVENS,
Director, Liberty City Community
Council.

WILMINGTON, DEL.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We object to placing Title #3 OEO under Governors Veto.

ROBERT AND KATHARINE WAY.

LANTANA, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urge Senate reject Senator Murphy's amendment to OEO Appropriation Bill allowing Governor's Veto Title 3B.

EDWARDS RODGERS,
President, Palm Beach County Chapter,
Florida Council on Human Relations.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please help defeat the Murphy amend-
ment.

S. W. GEORGE,
President, Broward County NAACP.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CHANCES FOR REELECTION GIVEN REAL- ISTIC APPRAISAL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, these are difficult days for President Johnson. Problems and more problems, domestically and internationally, weigh heavily on our Chief Executive.

President Johnson is beset by opposition, often within the Democratic Party, as well as from Republican. But a reasoned assessment of Mr. Johnson's reelection chances is contained in the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, September 27, 1967. It is titled "Johnson No Pushover." Most keen observers can agree.

Yes, President Johnson is a truly hard-working man. He is, I believe, a man to match our times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks, at this point, the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor,
Sept. 27, 1967]

JOHNSON NO PUSHOVER

The "dump Johnson" move failed at the board meeting of the Americans for Democratic Action in Washington, and maybe that was a victory for LBJ. Or maybe it was a modest victory for political realism within the free-wheeling, leftward-winged ADA.

It is normal for the ADA—and even for the

"New Left" which met in argumentative convention in Chicago recently—to make vigorous noises of dedicated protest. But the basic rule of politics is that "you can't beat somebody with nobody." When Sen. Robert Kennedy warmly endorsed the Johnson-Humphrey ticket for 1968 last May, he removed himself from the Democratic lists. There is no one else save the White House incumbent for Democrats to rally round.

By those political columnists who examine and reexamine the Johnson phenomenon, the President could be dubbed the "unhappy warrior," these recent months. The political polls which he so closely watches do not show that sweeping strength for the Democratic presidential ticket that they displayed in 1964. Yet even at this moment, at the supposed nadir of Johnson popularity, after a summer of ghetto violence and with Vietnam dragging on, the latest Harris survey finds that no Republican candidate is running ahead of LBJ.

Opinion polls can change rapidly, of course. But as of now the strongest Republican combination against Johnson-Humphrey would be a Rockefeller-Reagan ticket. These rival slates stand even at 50-50. A Romney-Reagan ticket would run seven points behind Johnson-Humphrey. Other possible GOP combinations lag further.

So Lyndon Johnson is hardly a political cypher. The Vietnam dilemma, the reduction in America's world prestige, the city savaging racial friction, the discreditable credibility gap, even the proposed tax increase—have in various quarters, combined to beat down the President's public image.

But this is a time when the United States is negotiating one of its toughest passages in history. It is fighting a war where issues are not clearcut and simple. It is experiencing a hometown revolution, as blacks seek to shake off what has been called internal colonialism. It is patiently continuing to pump out foreign aid in remarkable amounts and, as a practicing Christian, is not demanding "gratitude" in return.

In all this, Mr. Johnson has exhibited considerable dogged staying power. Governor Rockefeller said on TV last weekend that the President anticipated the problems of the cities with his antipoverty program. A political realist, LBJ knows precisely the value, or lack of value, in waiving unofficial peace envoys to Hanoi. Some intellectuals decry him as the last "frontiersman" President, but no one ever found a western (or southwestern) frontiersman to be lacking in steady patriotism.

Wily, resourceful, politically savvy, LBJ is a formidable force in and out of his party. If the Vietnam war were removed to the conference table before next year's election, he would be tremendously difficult to defeat. But even if Ho Chi Minh keeps the war going, and if the travail of America's cities persists, the hardest-working President in Washington's recent history will be no political pushover in 1968.

OREGON PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL 1968

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish once again to thank my good friend, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and all other members of the Committee on Appropriations for the fine help and consideration they gave the State of Oregon in connection with public works appropriations for fiscal 1968.

I wish to pay special tribute to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, the Senator from Louisiana, for his usual fine courtesy to our Oregon witnesses who appeared to testify in support of Oregon public works appropri-

tions and to the serious consideration and study he has given to the needs of our State in the field of public works appropriations.

One of the projects of special concern and importance to the coastal area of Oregon is Siuslaw Harbor, at Florence, Oreg. The preconstruction planning on the project was completed almost 2 years ago and the proponents of the project have, during that period, amply demonstrated the urgent need for the harbor improvement. The Public Works Subcommittee, under the leadership of the Senator from Louisiana, recommended funds for the project in fiscal 1967; unfortunately, we were not able to hold the Senate recommendation in conference. This year I am most grateful that the committee approved \$500,000 for an initial start of construction on this most desirable \$2,435,000 harbor modification project. I cannot overemphasize the importance of efforts on the part of the Senate conferees to hold the \$500,000 in conference because the economy of the area will be enhanced by this development and its benefits will be enjoyed not only locally but by the Federal Government through increased tax revenues.

The people of Oregon owe a debt of gratitude to the committee and to the Senator from Louisiana for retaining the items of \$100,000 and \$500,000, respectively, which were not recommended in the budget, but which were approved in the House of Representatives for development of the Cheto River harbor and the Tillamook south jetty. These excellent projects are long overdue, and the actions taken by the Senate and House of Representatives in including appropriations for these harbors will bring them to completion at a much earlier date.

The economy of Portland and the lower Columbia River area received a great stimulus when the committee increased by \$1,300,000 the House-approved budget request of \$2,700,000 on the Willamette River 40-foot project. Portland and other harbors in the lower Columbia River area will benefit greatly by the increased water commerce which will be induced by the \$22,600,000 Columbia River channel deepening program. It is my hope that the Senate conferees will do everything in their power to convince the House conferees of the wisdom of retaining the Senate-recommended \$4,000,000 for the Columbia River 40-foot project.

The Corps of Engineers has on file a long list of projects upon which bank protection works are required in the Willamette River Basin. Floods on the Willamette and its tributaries take their annual toll by way of heavy damage including the washing away of priceless topsoil. The people of the Willamette River Basin should be grateful to the committee and to the Senator from Louisiana for their action in recommending an increase of \$125,000 over and above the \$375,000 budgeted and recommended by the House for Willamette River bank protection. If this increase can be held in conference, it will mean the acceleration of work on bank projects which are long overdue.

In the area of funds for general investigations, the Senate Appropriations

Committee is to be commended for recommending a total of \$36,246,000, an increase of \$2,501,000 over the amount recommended by the House. These studies warn us of the needs in the fields of navigation, flood control, and related water projects. They represent wise investments in the future of our Nation.

To the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I wish to express the thanks of the people of Oregon for the excellent help he has rendered to my home State over the many years in the fields of appropriations for reclamation projects and the program of the Bonneville Power Administration. Not only did the committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Arizona, bring about the approval of the budgeted amounts for our Oregon projects, but it also recommended an impressive sum of \$21,555,000 for general investigations of reclamation projects. This reflected an increase of \$5,555,000 over and above the amount recommended by the House. This favorable action made possible the recommendation of a new reconnaissance survey of the land and water resources of the Juniper division of the Wapinitia project. We are indeed thankful for this new survey project.

In closing, I should add that the committee has followed an extremely wise course of action because it has recommended the investment of taxpayers' dollars in projects that will redound to the benefit of our generation and generations of future Americans.

EULOGY TO JEFF KIBRE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I was deeply grieved and shocked to learn of the death of Jeff Kibre on the morning of September 27 after a long illness resulting from a series of strokes.

A militant and vigorous advocate of the cause of labor unionism all his life, Jeff Kibre served during the last 15 years as a representative of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union here in the Capital.

In this capacity he served long and well. He became a familiar figure around Capitol Hill, and he counted as personal friends literally scores of Members of the Senate as well as the House of Representatives.

Across the country and in the Nation's Capital, his reputation as an acknowledged expert in all aspects of law pertaining to organized labor, to maritime and transportation became firmly established.

Many of the laws on our Nation's statute books stand as a monument to his memory. His lifelong work is indelibly recorded in the history of this country.

Before working as Washington representative of the ILWU, Jeff represented the Fishermen's Union on the west coast. Before that, he had been secretary of the United Studio Technicians Guild in Hollywood.

He was born in Philadelphia 60 years ago, but his family moved to Los Angeles when he was only 6 months old—so that he was reared and attended public schools in Los Angeles. He received his B.A. degree from the University of California in Los Angeles.

Earlier this year, Jeff retired from ac-

tive service with the ILWU and moved back to Los Angeles to recuperate from several strokes he had suffered—the first one of which occurred in October 1964, while he was on the island of Maui in Hawaii.

Even after retirement, and until quite recently, when he suffered another serious stroke which proved fatal, Jeff continued to assist the ILWU in an advisory capacity.

His life was cut off at a time when he was contributing significantly to the forward progress of our Nation. For Jeff was a thoroughly dedicated, fighting and courageous champion of workingmen everywhere.

He had great vision, and he had the courage of his convictions. Perhaps equally important, he knew how to go about implementing his ideas and his beliefs to make them realities.

Jeff slipped into a comatose condition on June 21 and never awakened after that. His death came peacefully. But he died as he lived all his life: his fight for life continued right up to the very end.

He is survived by his wife Pearl and a son, Joe, who is now doing graduate work at UCLA.

He also leaves four brothers, Maynard, James, Walter, and Bert, and three sisters, Cecile, Pearl, and Adele.

He will be sorely missed by all of his many, many friends here in Washington and throughout the country, including the hundreds of people who knew, admired and respected him in Hawaii. More than 600 delegates to the eighth biennial convention of ILWU Local 142 in Honolulu stood in 1 minute of silence in his memory 2 days ago.

Mr. President, the Longshoremen's Union has lost a loyal and devoted leader. Working men and women everywhere have lost an eloquent champion. The Nation has lost one of her leading citizens. I have lost a friend.

My wife, Ellyn, and my entire staff both here and in Honolulu join me in offering warmest and sincerest condolences to his wife, his son, and his entire family.

OUTSTANDING WORK OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in today's world of advanced technology and mass production, the Nation's small businessman is finding it increasingly difficult to keep abreast of change and innovation so vital to maintaining a competitive position in the business world.

Small industrial and service firms in New Jersey account for a large part of the total number of businesses in our State. They have contributed millions of dollars to the national economy, provided jobs for thousands of workers, and have also provided products and services essential to the expanding American economy.

I invite attention to the outstanding job that the Small Business Administration is doing in helping small business in New Jersey under the progressive leadership of its new Administrator, Robert C. Moot.

SBA has approved a total of 95 loans amounting to \$6,075,000 to small busi-

ever-growing numbers until total freedom is ours."

In keeping with Mr. Randolph's longstanding convictions on the necessity for achieving social change through the democratic process, the A. Philip Randolph Institute was established in New York in 1965.

Working with the A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund, it is helping to recruit and tutor minority youth to enter apprenticeship programs in the New York building trades unions.

This program already has placed 250 young men and it is significant that the only two who dropped out, withdrew to enter college. So successful has this program been that it is now being expanded to other cities with the financial support of the Department of Labor.

This, I believe, is the direction in which true progress lies—the path we must walk toward the goals of brotherhood and economic justice.

I have mentioned earlier, the courage of A. Philip Randolph and his willingness to hold fast to his principles in the face of persecution and vilification, regardless of how unpopular they might be at the moment.

And so it came as no surprise when rioting, looting and burning erupted in the streets of America this past summer, that he would be among the first to denounce the violence.

Joining with the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Roy Wilkins, and Whitney Young, on July 26 of this year, he issued a statement that said in part:

"We who fought so long and hard to achieve justice for all Americans have consistently opposed violence as a means of redress. Riots have proved ineffective, disruptive and highly damaging to the Negro population, to the civil rights cause, and to the entire nation.

"We call upon Negro citizens throughout the Nation to forgo the temptation to disregard the law. This does not mean that we should submit tamely to joblessness, inadequate housing, poor schooling, insult, humiliation and attack. It does require a redoubling of efforts through legitimate means to end these wrongs and disabilities. . . .

"... we support President Johnson's call 'upon all of our people black and white alike in all our cities to join in a determined program to maintain law and order, to condemn and combat lawlessness in all its forms, and firmly to show by word and deed that riot, looting and public disorder will just not be tolerated.'"

Events since those unhappy days have confirmed the judgment of these four leaders "that the riots have not contributed in any substantial measure to the eradication of these just complaints" and that the primary victims of the rioting were the Negroes themselves.

The plain truth is they have had just the opposite effect—stiffening opposition of pending civil rights legislation and hardening resistance to President Johnson's programs to improve life in the cities, to eradicate poverty and injustice, and to enrich the educational opportunities for the young people of America.

There are those, of course, who were against these programs all along and welcomed the riots as a convenient excuse for continuing their opposition.

But the vast majority of Americans do believe in these programs to eliminate discrimination and to correct economic injustice.

They believe, however, that they should be achieved in an orderly and peaceful manner—through the democratic processes that have served this Nation since it was founded.

As our President, Lyndon Johnson, said in his 1963 Memorial Day address at Gettysburg—

"In this hour, it is not our respective races which are at stake—it is our nation. Let

those who care for their country come forward, North and South, white and Negro, to lead the way through this moment of challenge and decision.

"The Negro says, 'Now.' Others say, 'Never.' The voice of responsible Americans—the voice of those who died here and the great man who spoke here—their voices say, 'Together.' There is no other way.

"Until justice is blind to color, until education is unaware of race, until opportunity is unconcerned with the color of men's skins, emancipation will be a proclamation but not a fact. To the extent that the proclamation of emancipation is not fulfilled in fact, to that extent we shall have fallen short of assuring freedom to the free."

And it is in this spirit—exemplified by the life and philosophy of A. Philip Randolph—that we will continue to make progress in the future.

LYNDON JOHNSON: THE URBAN PRESIDENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I disagree with those who tell us that the Johnson administration is marching "backward" on its urban programs, and that the administration is not doing enough in its poverty program, or not training enough people for jobs.

The fact is that there was no manpower training program until a Democratic administration took office in 1961 and adopted the policy that it is important to train people for jobs, and that Government should have a major role in such training.

Under Democratic administrations a million Americans have received job training and retraining—a record the Republicans can only attack, but cannot match.

The opposition asserts that we are not doing enough to fight poverty.

Well, there is one fact that is indisputable. Seven years ago when a Democratic administration took office, there was no antipoverty program.

But, today here is what we see under President Johnson's war against poverty:

Nine hundred thousand men and women have enrolled in Neighborhood Youth Corps across the land.

More than 200,000 talented but poor students are attending colleges this fall under educational opportunity grant programs.

Two million preschool children have already benefited from Project Headstart. Federal aid to vocational education more than quadrupled since 1964.

The second summer of the President's youth opportunity campaign has resulted in over a million jobs being made available to 16- to 21-year-olds since April 1967 alone.

In toto, almost 10 million people have been reached by the antipoverty program to date.

This is the very program which Republicans have tried to dismantle.

It was the Republicans in the House of Representatives who just a few months ago so diminished the model cities program and the rent supplements program. Republicans in the House of Representatives also voted, almost to a man, to stall the Federal aid-to-education program.

This is the same Johnson-Democratic aid to education program which in its

first year helped 8 billion boys and girls get a better education, and which last year aided another 9 million poor school children.

The fact is that Lyndon Johnson believes in the resurgence of our cities, and that he and the Democratic Party have worked hard, and will continue to work hard, for the people in our cities.

The record shows the results. The people will judge it, and not be misguided by partisan statements.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 548, Senate bill 2388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 356

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding other motions now pending, it be in order for the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] to call up his amendment No. 356, out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendment offered by Mr. Prouty is as follows:

On page 126, after line 11, add the following new title:

"TITLE III—INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

"INVESTIGATION

"Sec. 301. The Comptroller General of the United States (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Comptroller General) is authorized and directed to make an investigation in sufficient depth of programs and activities financed in whole or in part by funds authorized under section 2 of this Act, in order to determine—

"(1) the efficiency of the administration of such programs and activities by the Office of Economic Opportunity and by local public and private agencies carrying out such programs and activities; and

"(2) the extent to which such programs and activities achieve the objectives set forth in the relevant part or title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizing such programs or activities.

"REPORTS

"Sec. 302. The Comptroller General shall make such interim reports as he deems advisable and shall transmit his final report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1969. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of his findings and conclusions together with such recommendations, including recommendations for additional legislation, as he deems advisable.

"POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

"Sec. 303. (a) The Comptroller General or, on the authorization of the Comptroller General, any officer of the General Accounting Office may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as he deems advisable. Any officer designated by the Comptroller General may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Comptroller General or such designated officer.

"(b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Comptroller General, upon request made by him, such information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions under this title.

"(c) The Comptroller General is authorized—

"(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and

"(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$50 a day for individuals.

"(d) The Comptroller General is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of his duties under this title.

"AUTHORIZATION

"Sec. 304. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this amendment directs the Comptroller General to make an investigation of all programs financed in whole or in part by Economic Opportunity Act funds.

This amendment specifies that the Comptroller General's investigation shall be in sufficient depth to determine, first, the efficiency of the administration of

such programs by OEO and by local public and private agencies, including the questions of duplication of effort and overlapping of functions among Federal agencies; and, second, the extent to which such programs are achieving the objectives outlined as the intent of Congress in initially authorizing them under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The Comptroller General is authorized to enter into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, or individuals for the performance of such activities as he deems necessary to discharge his investigative duties. He is also given the discretion to hold hearings for purposes of taking testimony, and all Government agencies are directed to furnish, upon request, any necessary information.

Interim reports are required to be submitted to Congress as the Comptroller General deems available, but he is directed to submit a final report to Congress not later than February 1, 1969, containing a detailed statement of his findings and conclusions, together with recommendations, including recommendations for additional legislation.

This investigation will be truly representative of all aspects of the war on poverty, and should be equally concerned with the implementation of these programs in rural areas as it is in urban or city areas.

I consider this amendment as perhaps the most important one to be offered in terms of insuring the long-term success of the war on poverty.

I am happy to say that the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has agreed to accept the amendment.

With that statement, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is correct that I have as reluctantly agreed to accept the amendment as he has reluctantly agreed to cooperate in certain other areas.

My reasons for agreeing to accept the amendment I should like to state briefly for the record, because my position represents a change over what I thought was the proper thing to do earlier this year right on down to the present time.

The Senator will recall that at the time the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty sought funds from the Committee on Rules and Administration, and from the Senate to conduct the inquiry, evaluation in depth, investigation—whatever we wish to call it—the Republican members of the subcommittee urged very strongly that most of the funds we have obtained from Congress should be devoted to contracting with a private management firm in the free enterprise sector of the economy to make what our Republican friends felt would be an impartial and businesslike investigation of the poverty program. We on the Democratic side felt that it was part of the legislative process and part of our duty as members of the subcommittee to conduct our own inquiry, our own investigation, and we therefore rejected the position of the minority. We did, however, retain, with the money which was voted for us, seven consul-

ants, experts in the area covered by the poverty program, to make evaluations and reports to us on conditions in the several regions into which the OEO has divided its administrative operations.

Those reports were received and filed. I believe they were useful. They have certainly influenced me with respect to the position I have taken with respect to this bill, though it should be noted that those evaluations were independent of the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Nevertheless, I think my friends on the other side of the aisle from me remained unconvinced. I deplore it, but they do remain unconvinced that the study of the subcommittee was adequately objective, and they still remain convinced that an impartial investigation, outside the area of the subcommittee, needs to be made.

I still think it does not, but I think it is most important that we should minimize partisanship in this area; that we should, wherever possible, attempt to seek agreement between differing points of view.

I believe the suggestion made by the Senator from Vermont is perhaps—I use the word "perhaps" advisedly—a happy compromise between those conflicting views. That is because the Comptroller General is historically an agent of Congress. He is a part of the legislative branch of Government. True, he is appointed for a long term by the President of the United States, but I believe the precedents are clear that the Comptroller General is an arm of the Congress, an agency of the Congress.

Therefore, when the Senator's amendment proposes to turn this investigation of the poverty program over to the Comptroller General, he is, in effect, saying the Congress retains this legislative power of oversight, but, instead of delegating it exclusively to a legislative subcommittee, will share that responsibility of oversight of the program with another arm of the Congress, the Comptroller General.

I have great respect for the Comptroller General. I think he is impartial and able and has a good staff. Therefore, largely because I would like to have the minority believe that we in the majority do pay careful heed to their recommendations and their suggestions in this whole field, I am prepared to accept the amendment and take it to conference; and, indeed, to press it on our friends in the House when we get to conference.

That is about all I care to say about the Senator's proposal. I, therefore, accept the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania. I assure him, as I have in the past, that it is not my intent to sabotage this program in any way. I agree fully that the Comptroller General is perhaps the most desirable agency to conduct a study of this nature. I am sure it will be objective. I am sure it will be most helpful to all of us who serve on the committee.

My only concern with the investigation which has been procured by the committee is that it does not have the

numerical personnel or sufficient money to do the job which I think should be done.

I am grateful to the Senator for accepting the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I take it the Senator will agree with me that by authorizing the Comptroller General to make this investigation, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and its Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, does not in any way waive the investigative and oversight functions which we presently have with respect to this program.

Mr. PROUTY. No, it does not. I think it is most important that we continue to have it.

Mr. President, I am ready for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 351

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that other motions are pending, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to call up amendment No. 351 out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments (No. 351).

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (No. 351) are as follows:

On page 16, line 10, strike the words "The Director shall seek to" and insert in lieu thereof the words: "The Secretary of Labor shall".

On page 17, line 7, change the period after the word "offices" to a comma and add the following: "and shall furnish copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I mentioned in my remarks on Monday, I had several amendments adopted in committee which improve the effectiveness and recordkeeping of the Job Corps.

Amendment No. 351 proposes wording in the bill which provides that records kept by the organization in the placement of members of the Job Corps be placed with the Secretary of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator asking that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, these are simply clarifying amendments.

I understand that the distinguished floor manager of the bill has no objection to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending amendment makes, I think, a useful change in the present law. We discussed this subject in committee and agreed on language slightly different from that proposed by the Senator from Vermont in the present amendment.

I ask my friend from Vermont if I am correct that the purport of this amendment is to make it possible to send to whatever agency appears to be most sensible under the circumstances the last paycheck of a member of the Job Corps, but to assure that the Secretary of Labor has at all times copies of such correspondence or records. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is a useful amendment. I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the acting majority leader agreed to unanimous consent to set aside the pending business, seriatim, so the Senator from Vermont could continue to propose amendments.

AMENDMENT NO. 352

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the fact that other motions are pending, the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] may be permitted to call up amendment No. 352 out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment (No. 352).

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the amendment is short, and I would like to have it read to be sure I understand it.

Mr. PROUTY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment (352), as follows:

On page 30, line 11, add the following new sentence at the end of subsection (c): "In the case of programs under subsection (a) (1) of this section, financial assistance may be provided directly to local or State educational agencies to carry out such programs in accordance with policies, procedures, and requirements covered by existing agreements between the Director and the Secretary of Labor providing for the delegation to the Secretary of Labor of the Director's authority with respect to such programs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, my amendment No. 352, in effect, formalizes a practice which is presently being carried out by the Secretary of Labor. That practice is that the Secretary of Labor has authority to pay funds for the operation of in-school Neighborhood Youth Corps programs directly to local or State educational agencies.

I believe, Mr. President, that it is obvious why the in-school neighborhood

youth program is presently and should be funded by direct payments to the local or State educational agency. The very nature of the program is such that it is most properly run by the State or local educational systems.

It is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania is prepared to accept this proposal also.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, again my understanding is—and I ask the Senator from Vermont for confirmation—that this amendment merely puts into legislation what is currently the existing practice of the office. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is exactly what it would do.

Mr. CLARK. There has been some discussion within the committee as to the extent to which it is desirable to legislate administrative practices. Generally speaking, I believe there ought to be a great deal of flexibility reserved to the Director of OEO so that, as conditions change, administrative regulations can change, and indeed the whole area of the organization of programs can change to meet changing conditions.

However, the Senator from Vermont and a number of other Senators feel very strongly about the desirability of writing this particular provision into the law, and since it does comply with existing practice, and to me is quite unobjectionable, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I had been of the view that perhaps the Senator would modify his amendment; but as I heard it read, I understood it was just the way it had been printed.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I just noticed that I did not send the modified amendment to the desk, as I had intended. I do so now.

Mr. CLARK. May we have it read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modified amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 34, line 11, insert the following new sentence at the end of subsection (c): "In the case of programs under subsection (a) (1) to this section, financial assistance may be provided directly to local or State educational agencies pursuant to agreements between the Director and the Secretary of Labor providing for the operation of such programs under direct grants or contracts."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the amendment as modified, I believe, is an improvement over the original version. Therefore, I am prepared to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, notwithstanding other motions that are pending, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] be permitted to call up an amendment out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Has this amendment been printed?

Mr. PROUTY. No, it has not.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have a copy which I could follow?

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment of Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

On page 19, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(h) Title VI of such Act is amended by adding the following new section after section 618:

" 'RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOWTHROUGH PROGRAM

" 'SEC. 619. Pursuant to section 602(d), the Director shall delegate his functions under section 221(b) (2) to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such functions shall be carried out through the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.' "

On page 91, strike out line 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(i) Title VI of such Act is further amended by—"

On page 55, line 22, insert the following at the end of the sentence: "Funds for such program shall be transferred directly from the Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Financial assistance for such projects shall be provided by the Secretary on the basis of agreements reached with the Director directly to local educational agencies except as otherwise provided by such agreements."

On page 54, line 22, strike the word "subsection" and insert the following: "subsections (b) (2) and".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum so that I may have an opportunity to inspect the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, this amendment transfers the followup program to the Office of Education. It does so by providing that the director of OEO shall delegate his functions to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. President, under the committee bill, primary responsibility for administering the Follow Through program was given to the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, to fund the program directly through community action agencies. This was so despite the understanding between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of HEW which specifically spells out that grants would be made directly to local educational agencies, and administered by the Commissioner of Education.

My amendment simply restores the status quo.

It is again by understanding that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as I understand it—and I ask the Senator from Vermont whether or not by understanding is correct—the purpose of this amendment is to transfer the Follow Through program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct, in accordance with an agreement which they already have.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is attempting to write into the legislation the administrative procedures which are presently in effect.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I am not happy about this amendment, although I have agreed to accept it.

I believe that the Follow Through program still needs the watchful eye of the OEO. I would like the RECORD to show that the reason for creating the Follow Through program was that a substantial volume of evidence was accumulating indicating that in a number of areas of the country the young children, mostly 3 and 4 years of age but some of them 5 years of age, who had benefited enormously from the Headstart program, both the yearlong Headstart program and the summer Headstart program, were falling back when they got to the first grade or even kindergarten in the public school system and losing the benefits which they had attained from attending Headstart.

For that reason the OEO instituted the Follow Through program and retained control over it in order to assure that steps would be taken, which were not all educational by any means at all, to see that these youngsters held the gains they had made under Headstart.

It is true that for administrative purposes Follow Through has been delegated to the Office of Education. Nevertheless, there are many school boards and school districts in this country which are still allergic to the Headstart program and will, I fear, be allergic to Follow Through.

It does not follow, of course, because a program is delegated to the Office of Education that it need necessarily go from the Office of Education to the school board at the local level. Nor is it essential, I take it, with respect to the noneducational features of Headstart which involve medical and dental services and public health services and the bringing of the parents into the program to give them a little adult education so that they will be better equipped to handle their children when they come home, that it necessarily follows that all of this has to be abandoned.

I do not share the disillusionment of some Senators with the Office of Education. I think it is well run. I have very high regard for Mr. Harold Howe, the Commissioner of Education.

I could have wished that we could have retained flexibility so that if it turned out in certain areas of the country that the Office of Education was not having the appropriate impact on the local school system—for various reasons in-

cluding racial—that OEO could step in, as it did with the Headstart program in Mississippi, and see to it that an appropriate Follow Through program is carried on outside the formal bureaucratic structure of the local boards of education.

We must remember that this Follow-through, starting with the kindergarten and first grade children, is still getting these youngsters at a very young age.

I would think that in many areas it would be desirable for Followthrough to remain in the end under the jurisdiction of the OEO if that agency felt the school system in the particular area was not capable of handling it. However, I would like to suggest, as a matter of legislative history, and I wonder if the Senator from Vermont will agree with me, that the Commissioner of Education should be advised that it is the intent of Congress to be very sure, indeed, that the local school system, the local principal, and the local school board are sympathetic to the Follow Through program before he undertakes to make funds available to carry on this program in a school district which may well be philosophically opposed to the whole system.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I think that is highly desirable. I certainly hope that the Commissioner would make very certain that a school would intend to carry out the program effectively, efficiently, and without any discrimination whatever.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his concurrence in the views I have expressed.

Under those circumstances, I call the attention of Mr. Howe and his successors to this colloquy, and I am prepared to accept the amendment.

(At this point, Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the pending question as it pertains to the transfer of part of the program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, perhaps since the Senator from Vermont and I appear to be on the same side, I might be able to satisfy some of the doubts of the Senator.

Mr. HARTKE. I point out that I am basically in sympathy with the approach taken. I think it is a good amendment. I think we ought to put our house in order. However, it puts us in a sort of ridiculous position to take the Headstart program and insist on the one hand that it must be kept in the Office of Economic Opportunity and then take the program of carry through and say that this—

Mr. CLARK. Followthrough.

Mr. HARTKE. I should like the Senator from Pennsylvania to know that I am very much interested in all these programs. I disagree with him as to how they are being handled, and I disagree with the procedures by which we are trying to get some of the work done.

The mere fact that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have jurisdiction of this program, for jurisdiction over the program of Operation Headstart, would not mean that they necessarily had to be car-

ried through to the school systems all over the country if the school systems would not perform.

I believe the Senator will have to agree that what you are doing is duplicating governmental services. This would in effect provide for no elimination of duplication because all it would do would be to transfer from one administrative agency to another the operation of one of the programs that is before the country.

In good conscience, it certainly appears to me that since we have had a rollcall vote upon the question of Operation Headstart, this other program, Followthrough or Carry Through—what is the name of it?

Mr. CLARK. Followthrough. If the Senator will think about his golf game, he will get it right.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not a golfer. I am a basketball player.

The operation of Followthrough should be accorded the same right to have it nailed in or nailed out by rollcall vote.

I would respectfully suggest, if the Senator from Vermont were here, that he should give consideration to that fact.

I am hopeful that somehow it could appear that the entire Senate is heading in the same direction, that we are not going off in two directions at one time—that is, eliminating Headstart and putting Followthrough into the same category that the Senate voted against doing with respect to Operation Headstart.

Mr. CLARK. If I may say a word in support of my Republican colleagues, Senators PROUTY and JAVITS, the Senator from Indiana has a good deal of basic logic on his side in the comments he just made. However, I believe that when you get down to the grassroots and the actual administration of the program, the Senator might be prepared to concede that the logic is somewhat afflicted by having been evolved in a vacuum.

The fact is that Headstart was initiated as a poverty program largely because the school systems all across the country were not doing their business. They were not doing anything to see that the children from poverty-stricken families were given the preliminary and very simple educational, medical, public health, and other instruction and treatment which was necessary, when they got to the first grade, if they were to be able to keep up with those of their same age group.

The local school boards were not doing that, and the Office of Economic Opportunity, with what I think was great wisdom and with a great sense of initiative, undertook to create Headstart. I am one of those who believe that in due course Headstart should be transferred to the Office of Education. At present, Headstart has been delegated to the local school boards in approximately one-third of the programs during the wintertime and two-thirds during the summer. This is the point at which the situation becomes a little complicated, and I ask the Senator to acknowledge the existence of the complications. It

is much easier for a school board to run a Headstart program in the summer, when school is not in session, than it is in the winter, when the classrooms and the teachers are occupied in taking care of the children in the first twelve grades.

The fact that Headstart has been delegated to the schools already to the extent of two-thirds in the summer and one-third in the winter is some indication of a gradual transition from a new program evolved by a new agency, which was asked to pitch in and plan well, to a more established bureaucracy at the local level. In a couple of years, in my opinion, the time will come to put all of Headstart into the school boards. In the meantime, the Office of Education might have acquired some adult education itself.

When you move over to Followthrough, you find that the school boards are now approximately where they were with respect to Headstart two and a half years ago, except that since many of the Followthrough children are in the first grade and many school boards now conduct a kindergarten, the school boards have primary jurisdiction over these children, anyway.

The thought was to hold the money and standards in the OEO, in order, frankly, to put the match to the feet of the school boards to see that they did the job properly.

I, for one, would agree with the Senator from Indiana that perhaps this amendment is a little premature; we should keep Followthrough in the OEO, although delegated to the school board for another year or two. When you let the school boards run it, you avoid all the administrative duplication. But what you do is hold onto the purse strings and assure that where a school board is not doing the job it should, you will be able to take the money away from them, and OEO can run the program directly.

However, since the Director of OEO is perfectly willing to write into the law the present administrative practice, and since the Senator from Vermont and his colleagues on the minority in the committee feel very strongly about this matter, I am perfectly willing to accept their amendments. I do not see any logical inconsistency. It appears that way on the surface, but I do not believe there is any inconsistency.

So far as the rollcall vote is concerned, if the Senator from Indiana insists on a rollcall vote, I shall cooperate with him. But I wish to point out that a rollcall vote this afternoon—and this is the understatement of the day—might embarrass a number of our colleagues who, for various reasons, usually in the public interest, were of the view yesterday, rightly or wrongly, that we would have no rollcall votes this afternoon.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe I should say, on behalf of the majority leader, that the statement by the Senator from Pennsylvania, to the

effect that Senators might be embarrassed in the event there were a rollcall vote this afternoon, is a statement for which I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania takes full responsibility.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, I certainly do. But I have had a look at the list of absent Senators.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, so have I. But the majority leader has not put out this word. The leadership has not put it out. The leadership has indicated to all Senators who have inquired that there may be rollcall votes this afternoon. I wish to make that position clear. There may be rollcall votes this afternoon, and the leadership hopes there will be.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. May I say to the Senator from Indiana that I am in complete accord with what the Senator from West Virginia has said. But the ball is in the corner of the Senator from Indiana. If he desires to call for a rollcall vote this afternoon and can get sufficient Senators to the floor to order the yeas and nays, I certainly shall not stand in his way.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the leadership will cooperate in getting sufficient Senators to the floor, if the Senator from Indiana wishes to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity pro-

grams, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is the matter still open for debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw his request?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, with the understanding that I will not be precluded from offering this amendment on Monday, I withdraw the amendment at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps there should be an informal ruling from the Chair that the Senator is not prejudiced in any right to offer this amendment on Monday next, or any other day, when the bill is up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would be in order at the proper time on Monday or any other day while the bill is still before the Senate, and there is no preferential amendment or motion pending.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that is, the bill has to be before the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] have full authority to offer the amendment which was withdrawn prior to a vote on anything relating to title II; namely, the motion to send to committee with instructions, so that his rights will be fully preserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator include the second of the pending motions, the motion to strike title II?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Only the first. Only one motion is pending at present.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But there are two motions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Before either motion could be voted on—

Mr. DIRKSEN. If that is the desire of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I shall be glad to include both motions.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the distinguished minority leader wish to specify that the Prouty amendment, when it is resubmitted, will be the same amendment which has just been withdrawn?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Illinois is agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am perhaps mistaken, but I thought the Senator from West Virginia had withdrawn the motion to strike and then filed a motion to recommit.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No; that is not correct.

Mr. CLARK. Then will the Senator explain what the difference is? It seems to me that the two motions are practically identical; are they not?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No. As to the final result, they would be identical, but for procedural purposes the thought of the Senator from West Virginia was that it would be best to have a second motion to strike title II in the event the first motion was not agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from West Virginia, of course, is entirely within his rights. It occurs to me, as a pragmatic and practical matter, that there is little, if any, difference between the two motions. That is, of course, my personal opinion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We set aside an earlier motion on which agreement was entered into. At least, the yeas and nays were ordered on yesterday. Will the Chair now advise the Senate what motion was it that was temporarily set aside?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Illinois that there was proposed a unanimous-consent request but it was not actually entered into.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The pending motions were never set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from West Virginia has asked unanimous consent, in each instance that, notwithstanding the fact that there were motions pending before the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] be allowed to proceed out of order to bring up certain amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the present business of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that one motion to strike title II was offered after which a motion to recommit with instructions to report forthwith was called up.

The motion to recommit takes precedence over the motion to strike.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, the motion to recommit is the pending business of the Senate; is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That takes care of that.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CURRICULAR AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I am supporting the distinguished floor manager of the bill in trying to pass in the Senate a measure which, because of the care and thought that was given to it in the committee stage and on the floor, will survive the test of conference to become law, substantially as it passes this body.

I want to pay tribute to the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania for the consideration he gave to proposals offered in committee on certain aspects of the proposed legislation.

As an example of the type of thoughtful consideration that was given, I direct attention to sections 243(4); 243(6); and 224(d)(2) of S. 2388. The discussion of this language is to be found on pages 54 to 55 and 60 to 61 of Senate Report No. 563.

What I now say to the Senate is in the nature of legislative history on this language, and upon conclusion of my statement I shall appreciate hearing the comments of the floor manager of the bill on whether my summary of the committee report language is his understanding of the situation and reflects the intent of the committee.

The availability of financial assistance from the Office of Economic Opportunity to assist in the education of the poor has raised a number of questions as to the relationships which are to be established with the U.S. Office of Education and with State educational agencies and local schools. A number of persons in the education community have expressed concern about the role of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In order to clarify this question I offered, and the committee accepted, three amendments designed to delineate the respective responsibilities of the two

agencies. For the purposes of legislative history I would like to explain the theory upon which the delineation is based and to explain intent of the committee with regard to the amendments. Present law clearly prohibits community action program assistance for general aid to elementary or secondary education in any school or school system. The committee amended this provision to limit financial assistance in the educational field to such noncurricular educational services as special health, remedial, and welfare services. Nothing in the bill would expand the present authority of the Office of Economic Opportunity with regard to curricular education.

This limitation must be viewed in light of the fact that there are other funds available for the education of disadvantaged children. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes about \$2.4 billion for programs for educationally deprived children. Funds from the Economic Opportunity Act are not to be used to duplicate or compete with programs funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The coordination language in title VI is designed to insure that Federal programs be carried out efficiently and without duplication. In no case can community action funds be used to support a school program which competes with the public schools.

Community action funds may be used to make the services of school social workers and psychologists, nurses and doctors, speech therapists, and education specialists—such as remedial reading specialists—available to poor children when such children have a special need for those services. However, those funds may not be used to hire teachers or instructional personnel for schools.

The role of the Office of Education in the Nation's education program may be described as one of increasing educational opportunities by improving the quality of education offered by school systems as institutions. The Economic Opportunity Act is designed to increase opportunities for poor children. This necessarily involves improving educational services. The institutional approach of the Federal education programs and the individual approach of the antipoverty legislation converge in improving the educational opportunities for disadvantaged children. If duplication is to be avoided and if efficiency and coordination are to be attained, a distinction must be drawn where the two approaches meet—with the child. Poverty programs are intended to supplement education programs and therefore are limited to noncurricular educational services. For the purposes of this program curricular education, as distinguished from noncurricular educational services, should be defined as those aspects of education which are offered as part of the normal school program in the area to be served. I offered and the committee accepted three amendments which are designed to insure that, first, Federal, State, and local education programs and the community action programs will be mutually complementary and will not be duplicative or competitive; and second, Federal support of educational institutions will continue to be

within the purview of the Office of Education. These amendments provide:

First, that, educational services provided with community action program funds will be noncurricular in nature;

Second, that, in extending such educational services, there will be maximum use of the services and facilities of the Office of Education and State and local educational agencies; and

Third, that, where a public school offers educational services which can be expanded or adapted to meet more effectively the educational needs of poor children and the purposes for which assistance is being extended under the community action program, that school's services will be utilized in providing the extended assistance.

The administration and funding of the followthrough program has also been subject to question. The Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education have initiated a pilot followthrough program which is being administered by the Office of Education on the basis of a memorandum of understanding between the two agencies. The memorandum provides that funds authorized by title II of the Economic Opportunity Act and delegated to the Office of Education are to be used for grants to local educational agencies for followthrough projects. The Commissioner grants funds directly to local educational agencies. The committee bill has drawn up more explicit guidelines for the administration of all community action programs. Generally, all such programs within a community will operate under the general sponsorship of the community action agency for the community. The general change made in the funding of community action programs will not alter the basic operation and funding mechanism of the followthrough program. Local educational agencies will submit applications through the appropriate community action agency which will forward the application to the Office of Education.

Final approval rests solely with the Commissioner, subject to the conditions of the memorandum of understanding with OEO.

Nothing in the amendment would require a change in the memorandum of understanding between the two agencies.

PRINTING ERROR

I want to point out that there was a printing error in the committee report. On page 61 of the report in the second paragraph, the fourth sentence was garbled in the printing of the report. It should read:

The institutional approach of the Federal education programs and the individual approach of the antipoverty legislation converge in improving the educational opportunities for disadvantaged children.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the statement by the Senator from Oregon correctly reflects the interest of the committee. It is our view that efforts of community action agencies should complement and not duplicate the work of schools and other community agencies. Moreover, funds appropriated under the Economic Opportunity Act should not be used for curricular education but should be limited to special health, remedial, welfare and other noncurricular services.

An illustration of remedial services which would not duplicate in-school programs are special tutoring programs, such as those operating in store fronts and neighborhood centers with financial assistance under the community action program. In many communities these and related programs support and supplement the on-going school programs in poverty areas.

REPORT ON VISIT TO TEXAS WITH PRESIDENT JOHNSON TO INSPECT HURRICANE DAMAGE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Thursday, September 28, I accompanied the President of the United States to Texas on Air Force 1 for the Presidential inspection of flood-damaged areas of the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

In addition to the Presidential staff, the President was accompanied on this tour of inspection by my colleague in the Senate, Senator JOHN TOWER, the Governor of Texas, Congressmen ELIGIO DE LA GARZA and KAZEN, of Texas, and the outgoing Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Farris Bryant.

The President landed at Harlingen, Tex., where he inspected the refugee camps of the refugees from the flood waters of Arroyo Colorado, who were sleeping in public buildings. He made numerous inquiries as to the extent of the care provided for the refugees.

We then traveled by helicopter to Rio Grande City, Starr County, where the President inspected the food kitchen operations, where thousands and thousands of homeless refugees from both the United States and Mexico are being furnished food, and inspected the temporary hospitals set up in the schools of Rio Grande City to care for refugees from the flood who had become ill and were being cared for medically. The President then returned by helicopter to Harlingen, Tex.

The Governor of Texas had handed the President a request that 24 south Texas counties be declared an emergency disaster area. On the return to Harlingen, Tex., in a public announcement Thursday afternoon, September 28, 1967, the President of the United States declared those 24 south Texas counties an emergency disaster area.

The President, immediately upon the request from the Governor of Texas, moved with dispatch and with immediacy and with a sense of urgency and with a sensitivity of the needs of the people there, to the distress suffered by the people in this great area, where a million people reside and where hundreds of thousands are homeless in Texas and Mexico.

I commend the President of the United States for his personal attention to the flood-ravaged areas of Texas, and for the dispatch and speech with which he declared this to be a disaster area, immediately upon the legal right flowing to him to declare this a disaster area.

The President immediately made available \$2½ million of the President's emergency disaster relief fund for emergency disaster relief, on the preliminary figures by the officials involved. Twenty million dollars was the preliminary estimate of the emergency disaster relief that would

be required in this Hurricane Beulah disaster in Texas; and in their statements to the President, made on Air Force 1 en route to the Lower Rio Grande Valley, they said that this was a beginning, that the emergency disaster relief expense would be higher in the long run.

Mr. President, this makes the action of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, September 21, 1967, in adding \$10 million to the Bureau of the Budget's estimated \$15 million needed for emergency disaster relief for fiscal year 1967, a very necessary action.

With \$20 million being the first estimated needs for emergency disaster relief in the wake of Hurricane Beulah in Texas, and with the officers of the Office Emergency Planning and the State both stating that this was only a beginning, that the expense would be higher than that, the addition of the \$10 million by amendment on the floor of the Senate September 21, bringing the total appropriations for this fund to \$25 million, was urgently needed. The Senate acted with great vision in adding \$10 million.

It also points up the recognition by the Senate of the real problem when the leaders in the Senate on September 21 stated that additional funds could be added in the supplemental appropriation toward the close of this year's session of the Congress.

I thank my colleagues in the Senate for the unanimous action by which the \$10 million was added to the President's emergency disaster relief fund. My 3-day inspection in Texas on Sunday, September 24, Monday, September 25, and Tuesday, September 26, and my return to Texas with the President from Washington on Thursday, September 28, convinced me that the \$20 million will not be sufficient to pay all the public damage payable out of the President's emergency disaster relief fund, caused by the monumental Hurricane Beulah, which did an estimated \$1 billion in damage in Texas alone.

Mr. President, I am also grateful for the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee on Thursday morning, September 28, shortly before the presidential plane left Washington for the Rio Grande Valley, in adding \$1 million to the appropriation for the Army engineers for emergency work, looking to the rehabilitation of the intercoastal canal, the Corpus Christi ship channel, the Brownsville ship channel, and the other navigation facilities constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the area along the Texas gulf coast damaged by Hurricane Beulah. This, too, was a preliminary estimate. The chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, the Honorable ALLEN ELLENDER, senior Senator from Louisiana, stated that, on his communication with the Army Engineers, they had stated that this \$1 million would not be sufficient to rehabilitate the navigation facilities of the area—it was a beginning.

I am grateful to the Senate Appropriations Committee for moving with such great alacrity and dispatch and understanding in making this \$1 million available as soon as the appropriations can be passed through both Houses.

I have today addressed a letter to the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, which reads as follows:

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The past weeks have been especially difficult ones for the people of the Rio Grande Valley. The immediate job will be to restore community services to normal. After that the big clean up will begin. Undoubtedly many people who have lost their normal jobs will be utilized in this clean up operation. However, when that is finished the hundreds of individuals who earned their livelihood on the farms of the Rio Grande Valley, which have been devastated, will have no place to turn. The people who would harvest the crops which have been lost very likely will have no work, no money, and no place to turn for help. The time to think of their prospective plight is now.

I have heard from operators of canning factories who have told me they would not be able to undertake their normal canning operations because of the hurricane damage and that therefore there will be thousands of jobs lost.

I continue reading from the letter:

You recently announced that a number of workers would be allowed into California from Mexico in order to help harvest the crops. On Thursday September 28, 1967, Senator Murphy of California remarked on the floor of the Senate:

"California agriculture is today in a desperate state. I am advised that our farmers as of now need at least 3,700 pickers for tomatoes and grapes, and that this number will increase by at least 1,500 within a week."

Would it not be wonderful for California, for the farm workers in Texas who have lost their customary employment, and for the country that needs this food production if some way could be found to use the farm workers presently homeless and unemployed in the Rio Grande Valley to harvest the crops in California. This would not only help California and the Texas workers but would also make unnecessary the additional importation of foreign labor in order to harvest the California crops.

As Chairman of the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I stand ready to take any action you may recommend which will have the effect of getting jobs for these people whose lives have been uprooted by Hurricane Beulah.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

I add, Mr. President, the tomato crop in the Rio Grande Valley which was just being planted not long ago is lost. The crop now being harvested in California consists largely of tomatoes. The agricultural workers in Texas, whom this disaster has thrown out of employment are tomato and citrus fruit harvesters; for many of the crops grown in the valley are of the same type as those grown in California.

The loss of wages and employment by these agricultural workers has not been counted in the billion dollar loss created by Hurricane Beulah. I hope that a way may be found for some of them to be used to fill the need for skilled farm labor in California.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is now 2:45 on Friday afternoon. I had hoped that a number of Senators would be prepared to present amendments to be considered, and many of them, perhaps, modified and accepted; or, if necessary, that we might have proceeded to dispose of them adversely by rollcall votes. However, it now seems pretty clear that there are no Senators present and ready to propose amendments.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] to recommit the bill to the committee, with instructions to strike title II.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I intend to address myself in opposition to that proposal. However, I state for the benefit of the acting majority leader and the minority leader that if any Senator wishes to come to the floor and propose an amendment, I shall be entirely happy to yield the floor in order that such amendment may be presented, and we can at least debate it and determine whether or not it can be accepted, or modified and then accepted, or whatever the situation may be with respect to the particular amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. He did yield.

I ask that the Chair notify staff and all others that this will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 270 Leg.]

Allott	Dirksen	Mondale
Bartlett	Dominick	Monroney
Bible	Ellender	Montoya
Boggs	Griffin	Morse
Brewster	Hatfield	Pell
Burdick	Hill	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Stennis
Cannon	Jackson	Yarborough
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.
Clark	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Cooper	McIntyre	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee

[Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Anderson	Hansen	McCarthy
Baker	Harris	Mundt
Church	Hartke	Nelson
Curtis	Hayden	Randolph
Fannin	Hruska	Smith
Fong	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Gruening	Kennedy, N.Y.	Williams, N.J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

THE BUDGET

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in a remarkable editorial which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune of Saturday, September 23, 1967, entitled "The Budget Box: Panacea or Pandora?" the Minneapolis Tribune editorializes on the difficult and complex problems which confront our Government in funding the necessary programs, and in particular, the relationship of that funding to the current proposal for the tax increase.

While each of us may have disagreement with one or another of the suggestions contained in the editorial, the approach and its maturity are obviously of profound and compelling good sense.

The editorial concludes with this statement:

Instead of panaceas, Americans should look for accommodation.

They strike the theme of approach which should commend itself to every mature and public spirited American. I commend the Minneapolis Tribune for this editorial and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET BOX: PANACEA OR PANDORA?

Critics of the administration proposal for an income tax surcharge point to congressional reluctance to enact such a measure. They see Congress as reflecting the public weariness with excessive government spending programs which ought to be cut down before tax increases can be justified. The taxpayer, they say, is overburdened.

Nonsense.

At all levels of government, the rates of taxation are indeed high, but so are prosperity and both quantity and quality of public services. Certainly there are misguided programs, and just as certainly there are many people continuously looking for ways to change them.

The sweeping statement, "Cut down spending," is insufficient without the qualification of saying where it should be cut. If there is abuse in welfare programs, for example, should the public welfare concept be discarded in mystical reverence for the good old frontier days when men really determined their own destinies? . . . overlooking embarrassments like slavery, child labor, disease and starvation.

And no one objects to the elimination of pork-barrelling. Well, almost no one. The difficulty is the susceptibility of federal works projects to the law of inverse political geography: The closer the pork barrel is to one's own district, the less objectionable it becomes.

Of course there's the war in Vietnam which induces an economic myopia by the fact that its annual cost is about the same as the presently projected federal budget deficit of \$29 billion. Stop the war and stop the deficit! . . . that is, if the North Vietnamese and Russians and Chinese will only co-operate.

There is no panacea. The state of the economy is good, but potentially dangerous because of budget imbalance, a tightening money market, and an auto strike which may be the harbinger of steeper wage-price spirals.

In the enormous but tightly inter-related U.S. economy, a mixture of actions is what is needed: a federal tax increase combined with reductions in such categories as the supersonic jet transport and race-to-the-moon programs; and a strike settlement which gives auto workers less than the six

per cent annual increase demanded but will impinge somewhat on industry profits.

Instead of panaceas, Americans should look for accommodation.

ACTIVITIES, SUCCESSES, AND GOALS OF THE COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY IN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the war on poverty effort is now 3 years old and we are beginning to see the successes of this program and the opportunities it offers for the continual social and economic improvement of those living in poverty.

Recently, I received a letter from the Intercounty Community Council, the Community Action Agency for the counties of Clearwater, East Polk, Pennington, and Red Lake, in the rural northwestern part of Minnesota. This letter describes the activities and the successes of the CAA and outlines its future goals.

Mr. President, this letter serves as a testimonial to the efforts of the poverty program and as an example of how local communities in a rural area have been able to improve the conditions of the poor. It is a clear endorsement of the continuation of the innovative spirit associated with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERCOUNTY COMMUNITY COUNCIL, INC.,

Oklee, Minn., August 31, 1967.

Hon. WALTER W. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In order to assist you in your legislative considerations of Community Action Programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, this Council wishes to provide you with an evaluation of what has been done locally, what is planned for the future, and the status of Community Action Programs within this area.

Project Pretty-Up, Nelson Amendment, has employed 170 of our elder citizens on a beautification and community improvement program since June of 1966. 75% of these employees are 65 years of age, or older. They had been existing on below-subsistence Social Security benefits that averaged less than \$800 of yearly income.

The supplementary income provided by employment on Pretty-Up has enabled these older folks to purchase needed household appliances, to repair and improve their homes, to raise their standards of living by spending more for food and clothing, to remedy physical handicaps (one man used his first three paychecks to purchase a new artificial leg. Others have replaced, or been fitted with new dentures, eyeglasses, etc.), and to live among their friends and neighbors with the reinstatement of pride and self respect that comes from having proved their worth, their skills and their determination to still be a useful member of the community.

These are Pretty-Up benefits to the employees. Consideration should also be given to the community improvements. 21 villages in our four counties have cleaned and repaired public parks, streets and other facilities, and incidentally, spent a considerable amount of their local funds on problem areas, and with an enthusiasm and interest previously lacking.

Our Nursing Home Activity Program, operating in seven nursing homes, has taken hold like an epoxy glue. Residents of the homes, who had previously remained in their rooms, dejected and despairful, waiting only for death, have joined in and are proving to themselves, and to others, that there is still much to live for, and a considerable enjoyment in the process.

Recent County Fairs had entrees of craft-work from all of the Nursing Home Activity Projects. The ribbons they won hang proudly in the centers. We must consider this as an indication of the involvement these people now feel toward community affairs.

Our School Social Service Program, funded to provide family counseling for Head Start and other pre-school projects, has revealed new directions and concepts for home, school and family coordination, and according to school administrators is one of our most valuable programs.

We are now trying to have this taken over by the schools so that it may be expanded and improved through the use of educational funds. This, as with all of our projects, fulfills the committee of OEO to develop programs that are feasible for the area, that alleviate specific problems, and that are ultimately operative under local administration.

Head Start has proven itself in our area as it has in all areas. Here, it is furnishing the influence that promotes and permits the simple integration of Indian Children into predominantly white schools, and it is fulfilling its promise of social adjustment and cultural improvement for the children and families from more unfortunate circumstances.

Head Start is now being supplemented by a locally initiated Follow-Through phase that is attempting to insure a permanency of the effect of the Head Start program. This Follow-Through is on a local basis only and precedes a similar innovation at the Federal level.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps Project, sponsored by this CAA, has employed 564 youth from 16 Northwestern Minnesota counties during the summer and will continue such employment, on a curtailed basis, during the coming school session. It has provided income and work experience to boys and girls in dire need, and even more important, it has instilled in many the desire to complete or further their education.

All of these statements are the tangible and measurable benefits of programs sponsored by this CAA. There are other benefits, intangible perhaps, but no less important to our area and its people. They include the coordination of effort between our agency and other Federal Agencies that sees the benefits of all programs reaching more and more of the intended beneficiaries. After two full years of operation, our council is an accepted part of community service and the people we are organized to serve are turning to us for assistance of all kinds.

For the reasons mentioned, this council respectfully requests your careful consideration for the continuation of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the influence of your high office toward the maintenance of Community Action Programs at at least their present level of Federal assistance, and if possible, that such assistance be increased so that we may provide service and assistance to more of our people.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP C. STOLTENBERG,
Chairman
MERLE A. LINDBERG,
Vice Chairman
H. A. FINK,
Secretary
SIDNEY KIRK,
Treasurer.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

POVERTY AND UNEMPLOYMENT—THE INSEPARABLE TWINS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, over the past 20 years—almost, in fact, since the end of World War II—the Nation's unemployment rate has hovered around 4 percent. Seldom has it dropped below that point, and the several postwar recessions sent the jobless rate climbing to 5 percent, 6 percent, and higher.

We have learned in the last few years that even unprecedented national prosperity and affluence, and excellent economic growth rates, will not help some 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 unemployed. Our concern is based not only on the economic waste and drain that mass unemployment means. Our concern is also based on the human waste, the tragedy of millions of families sustaining themselves on substandard incomes or on pitifully inadequate public assistance benefits. We cannot begin to calculate the price this country pays in lost self-respect, despair, and frustration.

The Senate is here considering an omnibus antipoverty bill, legislation which we hope, when enacted, will help us continue our commitment toward the eventual eradication of poverty, hunger, disease, and illiteracy in the United States.

We must face the realities of poverty. We can never be wholly successful in abolishing poverty as long as mass unemployment persists. Poverty and unemployment feed upon each other, fatten each other. A man cannot endure prolonged unemployment in the United States without becoming poverty stricken and without his family suffering the consequences—which are inadequate housing, medical care, nutrition, and inadequate educational opportunities.

These deprivations are what unemployment means; they are also what poverty means.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has wisely seen that poverty and widespread joblessness are inseparable twins, twin afflictions, twin evils.

Those who have studied the causes of urban riots and disorder—those who have looked at the desolation of the urban poor—have nearly unanimously concluded that the lack of jobs is one of the major causes leading to the hopelessness and alienation which sets the stage for urban warfare.

The evidence is overwhelming. Expert after expert has agreed on this point.

Consequently, in developing this legislation and sending it to the Senate, the committee also incorporated into the basic bill what is known as the Emergency Employment Act of 1967. This is a specific and calculated attack on the problem of hardcore unemployment. It is an attempt to make a major inroad on the several millions of jobless Americans

seeking work today. It will create an estimated half-million jobs in the next 2 years.

One of the most important aspects of the purpose of the Emergency Employment Act is that the jobs it will create will be public service jobs. They will not be boondoggles or leafraking jobs, as some federally created employment was known during the depression years.

On the contrary, these will be public service jobs in badly needed and socially productive areas such as education, welfare, health, public safety, municipal maintenance, reconstruction, recreation, and neighborhood improvement. They will be the kind of public service jobs that cities and towns in every State of the Union need but cannot afford. They will be jobs that will have enduring social and economic value, and—equally important—will give the men and women who perform the work a sense of dignity, value and individual worth.

This public service employment is directed toward another goal. Rioting and civil war are a threat to the very structure of our society. Our society cannot do what is required if it is in shambles. This bill will help remove the causes of civil disturbances, violence, bloodshed, arson, and looting.

I would like to be able to say, Mr. President, that my State of Minnesota was singularly free this past summer of those storms of hatred and destruction that swirled like tornadoes through more than 40 communities, large and small, from coast to coast. But events in Minneapolis proved that no community has immunity, that the turbulence born out of discrimination—both economic and racial discrimination—can strike any American city.

Every mayor, every city official, every city councilman, and community leader who has commented on the outbreaks of violence in his city this past summer has, without exception, emphasized the fact of unemployment.

Beyond any possible question widespread and persistent joblessness has been the most powerful fuel to the flames of ghetto violence. The important fact is that the jobless rate among Negro residents of our big city ghettos has been—and is—enormously higher than the national figure.

The national jobless rate, as I have already pointed out, hovers around 4 percent, but the jobless rate in our Nation's slums is a horrifying 10 percent.

Even more appalling is the fact that the U.S. Department of Labor has found that in urban slum neighborhoods the unemployed rate among nonwhite 14- to 19-year-old boys is 31 percent and among girls 46 percent.

The Emergency Employment Act offers Congress a unique opportunity to defuse the explosive potential that continues to exist in the ghettos of our cities, large, medium, and small. And unless we do defuse this social and economic dynamite, we can expect the pressures to build up and the hazards to intensify.

This is neither bribery nor a reward for past violence. On the contrary, we are doing in this Emergency Employment

Act what we should have done long ago—remove the root causes of violence and hatred and hopelessness. We are depriving the hatemongers and the demagogues of their only weapons, their only instruments for the creation of chaos, if we wipe out mass unemployment and thus take the first big step toward the eradication of poverty.

Specifically what does this mean? The committee states that the number of jobless who can be reached depends on how long workers stay on these jobs before moving to other regular competitive employment. A conservative estimate is an average of 8 months, or a turnover rate that would mean 300,000 jobless could be reached in a year for each \$1 billion. The annual wage for these public service jobs would average \$4,000.

The question we face, it seems to me, is not whether we can afford the \$2.8 billion the Emergency Employment Act calls for, but whether we can possibly afford not to wipe out mass unemployment and all the evils of hopelessness and hatred that it breeds—or whether we can possibly afford not to avoid future violence and terror in our streets—or whether we can possibly afford not to prevent the destruction of billions of dollars worth of property.

The answer, of course, is "No," Mr. President. Preventive, not punitive, measures will safeguard our cities from violence and bloodshed and looting. Preventive, not punitive, measures will strengthen the economies of our cities, our States, and the Nation by eradicating the waste of mass unemployment.

Preventive, not punitive measures, will move us toward victory in the war on poverty.

The Emergency Employment Act, Mr. President, is a must, a necessity, for the Nation's immediate future and its safe and prosperous future in the years to come.

Mr. President, in closing, I should like to pay tribute to the distinguished, creative, and courageous chairman of the committee who handled the hearings and developed this great, impressive, and necessary bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I am proud to follow his leadership in this inspiring and most necessary proposal. In this effort, I take pleasure once again in saying that he is one of the great liberals—and—if I may say so—practical spirits in the country. I am proud to be with him on this question.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I want to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very kind words, which certainly warm the cockles of my heart at a time when there are those who do not agree with the somewhat extravagant estimate the Senator has made of my capabilities. I welcome him to this just cause and welcome him as an ally in our efforts to do something for the poor people of the United States of America. I am sure his inspired leadership will be of great assistance in the critical votes which we will have next week.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it has been suggested by some, as the Senator

from Pennsylvania has found, that the chances and prospects for this measure are not too bright. I am one of those who believe that, hopefully, we will be successful; but whether we are successful or not, I believe it is important that the fundamental issue which this proposal presents is the question whether we are going to make meaningful and substantial new efforts to improve the life of the ghetto dweller.

The effort to undertake the adoption of this proposal is important in itself because the word must get back to the ghetto that there are people in Congress who care, that there are people who understand, that there are people who realize that this problem cannot be solved cheaply; that it needs a substantial new effort on the part of the Federal Government.

I think that is an additional reason why the Senator from Pennsylvania is so wise in pressing this proposal.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say I hold, as of this afternoon, a measure of optimism that the heart of this bill will be maintained; that the effort to recommit will be defeated; that the motion to strike title II will fail.

I say this because I believe the conscience of America has been aroused; that the conscience of America will require that we, the Congress of the United States, face up, regardless of the apparent fiscal cost, to the necessity of assuring that unfortunate individuals of the United States of America, living in our teeming cities and in our rural ghettos, will be given that fair chance which they were promised by President Johnson 2½ years ago when he instituted the war on poverty.

I cannot believe that the conscience of America, as represented by the Senate of the United States, is so callous that we can pass, with practical unanimity, bills amounting to nearly \$80 billion for the swollen Military Establishment of this country and turn our backs on the poor of America.

Mr. MONDALE. Am I correct in understanding that virtually every expert who testified before the Senator's subcommittee in its exhaustive hearings, on the problem of getting rid of the well known frustrations and near rage which have become a national phenomenon, testified that jobs and the availability of jobs was central to the solution of this problem; that there cannot be a solution which does not include in the effort a real and substantial solution in finding employment for the ghetto dweller?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely correct. We had some 442 witnesses brought before the subcommittee from all over the United States. With the exception of the National Association of Manufacturers, there was only one extreme right wing representative of a small, and I might say, lunatic fringe group who was opposed to continuation of the poverty program.

With respect to title II, the special Emergency Employment Act, I have here a whole committee print of 184 pages of quotations from knowledgeable people in all walks of life, from all over the coun-

try, supporting a massive emergency job program.

Perhaps the most heartening thing that happened occurred 2 weeks ago when an Urban Coalition was formed consisting of leaders of American opinion from all across the spectrum. That spectrum ranged from people like David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, to I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America. It went from Mayor Ivan Allen Jr., of Atlanta, to Andrew Heiskell, chairman of Time, Inc. It went from Roy Ash, president of Litton Industries, to Mayor Joseph M. Barr, Mayor Jerome Cavanagh, and Mayor James H. J. Tate—respectively, mayors of Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Philadelphia. It included too Walter Reuther, George Meany, Whitney Young, and Roy Wilkins. It covered the whole spectrum of leadership opinion in America, as opposed to this motion to strike.

I say this with all sincerity, and perhaps with a stronger feeling than justified. The Senate will perhaps excuse my emotion under the circumstances, because of the long, long time in which I have been immersed in this problem. I think one can say the issue is whether the Government of the United States has been taken over by the Spartans, leaving the Athenians outside the seats of power. To me, those who believe in that kind of civilization in which the Age of Pericles was shining light should not now turn our backs on that vision of America in order to support a military group bent on war, instead of peace, and, in my opinion, constituting a grave threat to the survival of American democracy.

Those are strong words, but I have come to that point of view slowly and gradually, and I believe in my heart they are true.

Mr. MONDALE. I could not agree more with the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am glad he has mentioned the strong support given to his proposal and to the objective of finding jobs for the unemployed by the Urban Coalition. We had a large, balanced, highly prestigious delegation from Minnesota which was a part of that coalition. It included the mayor of my city. It included the publisher of one of our largest newspapers. It included many top businessmen and labor leaders from my State. They were unanimous that this proposal was not only something to be considered, but that it was absolutely essential. This is not the voice of the left wing radical being heard; this is the voice of responsible Americans.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. This is the voice of the conscience of America. I am happy to see so many successful businessmen joining in this effort. I think it should be of great interest to our colleagues when men of this caliber are willing to put their names on the list, not for the 200,000 jobs which title II of the bill would create, but for 1 million jobs, which would amount to increasing fivefold the amount asked for by title II of this bill.

Mr. MONDALE. We hear it said that the Senator is trying to push too far ahead with this proposal; that we are getting too far ahead of the American public. Yet we have an almost unprece-

dedented assemblage of prestigious Americans calling for a proposal bolder than the one we are calling for. We have had indications from recent Harris polls that about two-thirds of Americans think that jobs should be provided, among other things. I would say that this is a case of the Senate following, not leading. It is about time we caught up.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator is correct. People talk about power structures in this country. If this is the kind of judgment they want to make as Americans, if they want to go along with the power structure, they had better take a long, hard look at the recommendations of the Urban Coalition, instead of the political-military industrial complex, which, in my opinion, is leading this country down the road to fiscal ruin.

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to support the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CURTIS obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding other motions that are pending before the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska be permitted to bring up an amendment out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—do we have an understanding that, in the event the unanimous-consent request is agreed to, there will be no vote had on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Under those circumstances, I have no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 341

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 341 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] proposes amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$2,258,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,963,000,000".

On page 2, beginning with "\$295,000,000" on lines 5 and 6, strike out down through "title I of such Act," on line 7.

On page 2, beginning with line 22, strike out through line 8 on page 26 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"JOB CORPS REPEALER

"Sec. 101. Part A of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is hereby repealed."

At the end of the bill add the following new title:

"TITLE III—AMENDMENT TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

"INCREASED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION

"Sec. 301. Section 2 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, \$60,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, \$118,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, \$177,500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, \$225,000,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each fiscal year there-

after, \$420,000,000 for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished manager of the bill, the Senator from Pennsylvania.

It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] will speak on his amendments at some length this afternoon, at least sufficiently to lay the groundwork.

He has indicated that he would be agreeable to a time limitation of 1 hour on his amendments at the conclusion of morning business on Monday, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Pennsylvania, the manager of the bill, and the author of the amendments, the Senator from Nebraska.

What is the thought of the Senator from Pennsylvania as to that proposal?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to have that time extended to 1 hour on each side. This is a very important amendment; it seeks to cut the heart out of the Job Corps. I would, however, agree to a limitation of 1 hour on each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Up to 2 hours, then, the time to be equally divided.

Mr. CURTIS. Very well.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business on Monday next, at which time the pending amendments will become once again the pending business, there be a time limitation of not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Pennsylvania, the manager of the bill, and the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. CURTIS], the proponent of the amendments now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That after completion of the routine morning business on Monday, October 2, 1967, further debate on Amendment No. 341, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], to the bill S. 2388, a bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, be limited to 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in order that I may speak very briefly to the majority leader, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this amendment would substitute a vastly enlarged program of vocational and technical training in lieu of the Job Corps.

The bill before us authorizes the sum of \$295,000,000 for the Job Corps. Amendment No. 341 strikes that out, repeals the Job Corps, and increases the authorization for the Vocational Training Act of 1963 from \$225,000,000 to \$420,000,000. This increase would substantially double the amount of money currently being spent by the Federal Government on vocational education under the act of 1963 and at the same time save the taxpayers \$100,000,000 annually. The adoption of amendment No. 341 would result in a better job and the elimination of more poverty.

Mr. President, what is it that is needed to make a nonproductive and dependent individual who is able-bodied into a self-supporting, productive member of society? I believe the need is twofold:

First, he must be trained to perform useful work. He must have the knowledge and skills which are needed in our economy to the end that not only a job but advancement can be his.

Second, he must have character, a desire to be self-supporting, productive, and helpful to others or, in other words, the motivation to make his life worthwhile.

I seriously doubt if the latter can be acquired by the passage of a law. The providing of schools, however, to meet the first need is clearly the responsibility of Government. The untrained cannot provide their own schools.

Mr. President, if my amendment No. 341 were to be adopted and the amount authorized for vocational training were appropriated, it would enable the States to make a massive attack on unemployment. The following table has been assembled showing the amount of money currently allocated to each of the several States under the Vocational Act of 1963 and the amount which each State would receive if the sum set forth in amendment No. 341 were authorized and appropriated. It must be borne in mind that States and localities participate under the 1963 Vocational Education Act, so the total amount of money available to train individuals for good jobs would increase much more than the table herein listed would indicate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table I(a) and table I(b) be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I(a).—Allotment of Federal funds for grants to States and outlying parts under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210) fiscal year 1967, based on appropriation of \$198,225,000

State:	
Alabama	\$4,610,512
Alaska	245,236
Arizona	1,805,218
Arkansas	2,519,605
California	14,665,140
Colorado	1,946,059

TABLE I(a).—Allotment of Federal funds for grants to States and outlying parts under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210) fiscal year 1967, based on appropriation of \$198,225,000—Con.

State—Continued	
Connecticut	\$2,171,198
Delaware	390,298
Florida	6,199,468
Georgia	5,810,089
Hawaii	797,792
Idaho	890,996
Illinois	8,216,394
Indiana	4,907,895
Iowa	2,883,076
Kansas	2,391,526
Kentucky	4,131,417
Louisiana	4,537,243
Maine	1,189,505
Maryland	3,202,493
Massachusetts	4,351,359
Michigan	7,856,956
Minnesota	3,720,844
Mississippi	3,132,779
Missouri	4,274,571
Montana	796,156
Nebraska	1,508,981
Nevada	337,727
New Hampshire	722,359
New Jersey	5,340,073
New Mexico	1,302,460
New York	13,630,868
North Carolina	6,711,898
North Dakota	794,770
Ohio	9,793,732
Oklahoma	3,005,524
Oregon	1,965,985
Pennsylvania	11,185,718
Rhode Island	888,672
South Carolina	3,614,447
South Dakota	833,066
Tennessee	4,954,951
Texas	12,595,165
Utah	1,200,597
Vermont	482,651
Virginia	5,507,219
Washington	2,942,267
West Virginia	2,403,411
Wisconsin	4,173,147
Wyoming	340,700
American Samoa	35,423
District of Columbia	546,495
Guam	107,156
Puerto Rico	3,599,103
Virgin Islands	56,610

TABLE I(b).—Allotment of Federal funds for grants to States and outlying parts under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210) fiscal year 1968, based on estimates of appropriation of \$420,000,000

State:	
Alabama	\$9,769,383
Alaska	519,653
Arizona	3,825,051
Arkansas	5,338,886
California	31,071,627
Colorado	4,123,364
Connecticut	4,600,048
Delaware	826,938
District of Columbia	1,157,713
Florida	13,135,073
Georgia	12,311,172
Hawaii	1,690,512
Idaho	1,887,962
Illinois	17,407,897
Indiana	10,398,779
Iowa	6,108,701
Kansas	5,067,158
Kentucky	8,754,147
Louisiana	9,614,059
Maine	2,520,393
Maryland	6,785,416
Massachusetts	9,219,235
Michigan	16,647,209
Minnesota	7,883,836
Mississippi	6,638,492
Missouri	9,056,679
Montana	1,686,961
Nebraska	3,197,228

TABLE I(b).—Allotment of Federal funds for grants to States and outlying parts under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210) fiscal year 1968, based on estimates of appropriation of \$420,000,000—Continued

State—Continued	
Nevada	\$715,533
New Hampshire	1,530,523
New Jersey	11,313,752
New Mexico	2,759,881
New York	28,878,477
North Carolina	14,222,152
North Dakota	1,684,076
Ohio	20,750,494
Oklahoma	6,368,179
Oregon	4,165,530
Pennsylvania	23,699,012
Rhode Island	1,882,856
South Carolina	7,659,175
South Dakota	1,765,177
Tennessee	10,498,864
Texas	26,687,298
Utah	2,544,025
Vermont	1,022,674
Virginia	11,669,144
Washington	6,234,171
West Virginia	5,092,596
Wisconsin	8,842,058
Wyoming	721,891
Guam	227,078
Puerto Rico	7,626,780
Virgin Island	119,961
American Samoa	75,071

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that my amendment would double the current allocation to each State for the purpose of vocational and technical training under the 1963 act. For example, Alabama, at the present time, receives \$4,610,512. Under my proposal, that State would receive \$9,769,383; and so on down the list.

Mr. President, it is said that the Job Corps is doing a better job than when it started. I am willing to concede that some progress has been made. I venture to say, however, that those Job Corps projects which have been most successful are the ones where a good program of vocational and technical training has been carried out. I believe the Job Corps project at Lincoln, Nebr., has done an unusually fine job under the circumstances. Its per capita cost is far below the national average. It has some very fine, dedicated people in charge. The central theme is vocational and technical training. I hasten to point out that the adoption of my amendment No. 341 does not mean the end of vocational and educational training at the site of the Lincoln Job Corps, which is occupying part of the facilities formerly used by the Air Force. The State of Nebraska could take over the activities, do a better job, and reach more people for less money.

It is my understanding that the national average cost per enrollee in the Job Corps is \$6,950. This is a tremendous sum of money. I understand that the Lincoln Job Corps operation which I mentioned is much less than the average. I believe the Lincoln figure is a little over \$5,409 per enrollee, but this is clearly out of line with the cost incurred by the State of Nebraska in operating the Nebraska Vocational Technical School in Milford, Nebr.

In arriving at the cost per enrollee at the Lincoln Job Center, nothing has been allocated to regional and national costs, and we know that bureaucracy is

weighted down with a lot of high-priced people who are constantly on the move at the taxpayers' expense.

I wish to give a few facts about the Nebraska Vocational Technical School in Milford, Nebr. because it is a typical example of what can be done by States, localities, individuals, and the Federal Government.

The Milford school operated 11 courses of training with an enrollment of 958 students last year at a cost of \$1,076,058, or an average of \$1,123.26 per student. This cost includes equipment but not construction. Federal funds accounted for \$352,911 of the total, or \$368.38 per student; State funds, \$384,045, or \$400.88 per student; other sources, including tuition and earnings from production, \$339,102, or \$354 per student. Tuition for Nebraska students is \$84 a quarter or \$336 a year—the school has four 12-week quarters, or a 48-week year.

The Milford school also operates dormitory and cafeteria services. These cost a total of \$185,500 last year, or an average of \$193.60 per student, but all students did not utilize these services. The school charges \$50 a quarter for dormitory residence and \$100 a quarter for cafeteria services for students who want these services. Thus, a student can receive board and room at the school for \$600 for a 48-week year.

Based on the figures in the foregoing two paragraphs, we find that the average enrollee cost to the school is \$1,123.23. When we add to this the \$600 for cafeteria and dormitory costs, it makes a total cost per enrollee of \$1,723.23.

What do the foregoing cost comparisons mean? They mean that the cost per enrollee for the federally operated Lincoln Job Corps project is more than 2½ times that of our State-operated school at Milford. It must also be borne in mind that under the terms of the 1963 Vocational Training Act and in actual practice non-Federal sources are raising as much money or a little more than the amount of the Federal grant. This lower cost of operation, plus State and local sharing of the cost, means one thing: For every dollar spent by the Federal Government under the 1963 Vocational Training Act, the actual vocational and technical training provided is at least five times that which is provided by the Job Corps.

Again, let me stress that this illustration in Nebraska is very conservative. On a national level, the good to be accomplished by the adoption of my amendment would increase not fivefold, but much more than that. I also remind Senators that the adoption of amendment No. 341 would save \$1 million annually.

Nationally, the Job Corps is in disrepute. It does not have the confidence of the American people. It has been overloaded with bureaucrats, and tremendous sums that should have been used to train minds and hands have been spent flying enrollees as well as bureaucrats all over the country. The young people intended to be helped are taken away from home and in some cases exposed to mass immorality. Nobody has an accurate check as to what happens to them after they leave the Job Corps. The basic plan

of the Job Corps has some erroneous features. Vocational and technical training should be offered right in the community where the potential enrollees live. What better tax-supported function could be used to set an example in a depressed or slum area than an institution which trains people who want to be trained? Those who would view the institution first hand would see the opportunities which come to those who make good on their training. The mere location of these training centers in such an area would be a great motivating force without which we cannot attempt to cure the chronic unemployment existing in these areas.

A State-operated or locally run vocational training school is in a position to keep track of its students and know what happens to them. The fact is that industry picks up the graduates as fast as they are turned out. In Nebraska our vocational and technical training schools are not tied to an antiquated, historic pattern. They are based upon the needs of employers today, tomorrow, and next year. There is no accurate information as to what happens to the vast majority of Job Corps enrollees.

It must be pointed out also that even if the Job Corps were without blemish in its operation and without the moral problems that have arisen in some places, it reaches only a tiny fraction of the individuals who need to be reached for vocational and technical training. Those Job Corps enrollees who do complete their training probably seldom, if ever, go back to improve the surroundings from which they came.

We need to train more people and we need to do a better job of training people. To do this, it is necessary for us to get more for our money. I offer this amendment not because of any hostility toward Job Corps enrollees or the competent, dedicated instructors and administrators that we find here and there in the Job Corps. I offer this amendment because I am interested in having my Government improve the lot of those individuals who need a chance. The facts are conclusive that a partnership arrangement with State and local governments and individuals brings into play forces that make the training program a success.

In addition to all the costly procedures of the Job Corps in flying people around the country, taking over hotels, and other costly operations which seem to go hand in hand with a Federal bureaucracy, the fact is that the Job Corps at best is not reaching enough people to make a dent in the chronic unemployment. I will leave it to each Senator to draw his own conclusion as to the quality of training and the success which is being made by the Job Corps. On the number of people being reached, however, there can be no dispute.

Mr. President, I am aware that the costs of running a vocational or technical school are higher in many States than the illustration I used with reference to the Nebraska Vocational Technical School at Milford, Nebr. I point out, however, that the costs of running more Job Corps centers elsewhere is far, far in excess of the figure which I have used in reference to the Job Corps center at Lincoln.

Consequently, the relative comparison of what we get for our money under these two programs is applicable to all States.

Mr. President, I want to add that the Nebraska Vocational Technical School at Milford has been operating for a number of years and is doing an outstanding job. I want to give some brief facts about a new school operating within 30 miles of my home. I refer to the Central Nebraska Area Vocational School at Hastings. This school has been operating only a couple of years. It has the equivalent of 800 full-time students for the budget year. Like the Milford school, it operates for 48 weeks a year. The Hastings school's budget is \$2,075,000. This means an average cost per student of \$2,037, but because the school is new, considerable sums must be spent on equipment. Exclusive of equipment, this school is operating for a cost of \$1,380 per year for each enrollee. If we add to that the food and dormitory costs which are paid at the Milford school, we would find that their costs of operation, exclusive of equipment, would be about the same.

I am sure there are many institutions in other States that likewise are doing a superb job. I have used as my illustrations those schools about which I have the most knowledge.

Mr. President, I am not going to submit a bill of particulars of the weaknesses and failures of the Job Corps. These weaknesses and failures are common knowledge and they have been well documented over the months. Most Senators can and do privately relate many shortcomings of the Job Corps. We should not be unmindful, however, that the taxpayers' money has been used to lobby for the Job Corps. This has been freely done by many of those who hold high-paying positions in the Job Corps.

I do want to point out that the program of the Job Corps in removing individuals from their own environment, is not solving the problem faced by the majority of the individuals enrolled and it is definitely not solving the problem of the areas from which they come. In this connection I wish to read from testimony taken by the Senate Committee on Finance on Tuesday of this week. The witness was one who had spent many years in welfare work in New York City and is dedicated in her desire to better the lot of the unfortunate. Please notice this testimony. The witness is Dr. Trude W. Lash, executive director, Citizens' Committee for Children of New York:

Senator CURTIS. How many individuals have been taken out of New York City to be trained by the Job Corps elsewhere?

Dr. LASH. Very few, sir. I am not sure about the exact number, but I think it is below 3,000; very few.

Senator CURTIS. So the Job Corps has not made much of a dent in training the people who need training in New York City?

Dr. LASH. No, no sir, it has not, and also those who know the situation best have questioned the removal of the young people under all circumstances and have wondered whether sometimes—

Senator CURTIS. I am very interested in that remark, because I question the wisdom of it as you have expressed there. It is because of those who go, perhaps a much, much smaller number return and never add anything to the poverty-stricken area from which they were taken.

Dr. LASH. Yes, sir. Also a good many come back because they are homesick. It is very difficult for children who have never perhaps been even 20 blocks away from their homes suddenly to be taken to a place where it is quiet and there are birds and everything is scary whereas the noise is needed to be reassuring.

Senator CURTIS. Is it not also true that a well-organized and productive training program in a slum area sets an example for the whole area and provides a worthwhile activity there that makes a contribution?

Dr. LASH. I completely agree; particularly under the present circumstances after the summer's difficulties, this would be so.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this amendment, because it would be of more and better help to the unfortunate unemployed individuals and would reach vastly greater numbers, and at the same time would result in a substantial saving to the Federal Treasury in this time of war, unprecedented deficits, and demands for a tax raise.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope very much that the proposed amendment will be defeated when it comes to a vote on Monday. I shall have more to say about it during the hour which has been set aside for the opponents of the amendment under the unanimous-consent agreement.

For the moment, I should like merely to categorically disagree with many of the statements made by my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, and with most of the conclusions which he drew in his argument in support of the amendment.

Let me point out that the Job Corps got off to a shaky start shortly after it was established as a result of the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. There were many bugs in the Job Corps; there was much dissatisfaction with it. I believe the OEO, under Mr. Shriver, has by now got most of those bugs out.

I believe I speak with some knowledge of the facts, since not only have I heard the testimony, but also, I have visited Job Corps centers, and my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Poverty have been to a number of other Job Corps centers. In fact, I believe that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] will have some statements to make in this regard as a result of the field hearing he held in Wisconsin, which concentrated pretty much on the Job Corps.

The consensus of testimony which was brought before the committee was that the Job Corps, as I have said, after a slow start, turned the corner toward success around the first part of 1966. It has been improving constantly since then, and presently is doing a fine job all over the country.

I recall that in January and February of 1967 there was much criticism in the local papers in New Mexico about the women's Job Corps Center in Albuquerque—criticism which, quite frankly, rather shocked me. The center was operated by the Bell-Packard Corp., a private contractor for profit, with some expertise in the field of personnel management.

I made a fairly careful examination of those criticisms on the site and found—at least, to my own satisfaction—that much of it had been remedied. The troublemakers had been discharged from

the staff, the faculty, and a new superintendent had been brought in. I had an opportunity to discuss with the girls in the center alone, when none of the faculty or employees of the center were present, their views about the type of training they were receiving, and they were all enthusiastic about it. I believe this is generally true with respect to the other centers across the country.

So I would categorically deny that the American people are fed up with the Job Corps. Our own testimony and my own soundings indicate to me that the people of the United States are enthusiastic about the Job Corps and the splendid work which is being done with 42,000 boys and girls, in making useful and employable citizens of them.

The committee retained a consultant, Mr. Sar Levitan, a distinguished social scientist from George Washington University, who was engaged in making an evaluation of the Economic Opportunity Act for the Ford Foundation and he undertook to do some special work for the subcommittee.

His report on the Job Corps begins at page 1 in volume I of the staff and consultants reports in "Examination of the War on Poverty." I quote briefly from his comments on page 23, which have reference to proposals of which the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is typical. Mr. Levitan said:

Recent proposals (H.R. 10682, 90th Cong.) to place the Job Corps in the Vocational Education Division in the Office of Education, presents inherent problems, despite the indicated advantages. Since the residential centers would be operated by State vocational authorities, there would prevail in a number of States serious obstacles to establishing racially integrated residential centers.

This would be particularly true in the South.

While few Job Corps centers were located in the Southeastern States, where the problem was most acute, youths from these areas could enroll in centers outside their State or region. State operation of residential centers would intensify problems of integration and probably preclude some youths from enrolling. Past experience has shown that Federal proscription of racial discrimination does not solve the problem.

The vocational education establishment might also lack experience in handling the special problems of operating residential centers for disadvantaged youth. The Job Corps has gained considerable expertise in this area from its two and a half years of experience.

Mr. Levitan concludes that transferring the Job Corps to HEW and to the vocational education program would be a doubtful solution.

Mr. President, I will have more to say on this subject on Monday. At the moment, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in view of a certain colloquy which occurred in the Chamber today I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph under the heading "Program" in column 3, page S13864 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the paragraph was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I believe

the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] feels there will not be a vote on the pending motion before Monday next. The Senate will meet tomorrow at noon, and it is hoped that action can be taken to dispose of several amendments on tomorrow. There may be rollcall votes; I cannot be sure.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on yesterday six or eight Senators asked me, during the afternoon, whether or not it was likely that there would be any rollcall votes today. At the end of the day on yesterday I felt it to be my duty to contact those Senators who had made such inquiries and to indicate to them as best I could what the outlook might be for today. I dictated to a member of my staff the following verbiage, which I asked her to impart, by telephone, to the offices of those Senators to whom I have alluded. She accordingly relayed to those offices the following message which I had dictated:

Senator Byrd said that it was impossible for him to get an exact reading on the outlook for tomorrow. But there will not be a vote before Monday on the motion to recommit the bill to delete Title II. That is for sure.

Senator Byrd hopes that action can be taken to dispose of some of the lesser amendments tomorrow. There could possibly be one or more rollcall votes in this regard. Senator Byrd is not sure.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 2, 1967, at 12 noon.

Oct 2, 1967

SENATE

13. POVERTY. S. 2388, the poverty bill, was made the pending business. p. S13991
14. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 12474, the NASA appropriation bill. p. D871
15. EMPLOYMENT. Sen. Inouye commended the administration's "test program to mobilize the resources of private industry and the Federal Government to help find jobs and provide training for...America's hard-core unemployed" and inserted the President's statement on this. pp. S13978-9
16. TAXATION. Sens. Proxmire and Hartke spoke against a tax increase and inserted supporting articles. pp. S13977, S13981-4, S13990-1
17. 4-H CLUBS. Sen. Mundt called attention to National 4-H Week, Sept. 30 through Oct. 7, and commended the 4-H program. pp. S13977-8
18. POPULATION BALANCE. Sen. Muskie commended and inserted from the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations an "Outline of Study of Balanced Urbanization and New Community Development." pp. S13979-81
19. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Kennedy, N. Y., inserted a speech by Vermont's Governor Hoff "stressing the need for the full development of the hydroelectric resources of the Northeast and the necessity of creating and maintaining a strong competitive force of public power to bring low-cost and reliable electric power to the region." pp. S13971-3
20. RECLAMATION. Received from Interior a "project proposal under the provisions of section 10 of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956." p. S13958
21. TAX SHARING. Received a resolution adopted by three city councils in Calif., "favoring the enactment of some form of a Federal tax-sharing program." pp. S13958-9

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

22. TEXTILES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Zwach urging enactment of the proposed Textile Trade Act of 1967. p. A4871
23. OPINION POLL. Rep. Rogers, Fla., inserted the results of an opinion poll. p. A4876

BILLS INTRODUCED

24. TEXTILE IMPORTS. H. R. 13254 by Rep. Rhodes, Pa. and H. R. 13256 by Rep. Utt, to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to Ways and Means Committee.
25. FOOD ADDITIVES. H. R. 13249 by Rep. Denney and H. R. 13257 by Rep. Wilson and others, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Remarks of Rep. Denney, p. H12817, Rep. Wilson, p. H12816

26. FOREIGN TRADE. H. R. 13262 by Rep. O'Neill, Mass., to amend the tariff schedules of the United States to provide that the amount of groundfish imported into the United States shall not exceed the average annual amount thereof imported during 1963 and 1964; to Ways and Means Committee.
H. R. 13263 by Rep. Shipley, to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to establish more effective criteria for a finding of serious injury to domestic industry as a result of concessions granted under trade agreements to make mandatory the findings of the Tariff Commission with respect to the necessity for tariff adjustment; to Ways and Means Committee.
27. FEES. S. 2494 by Sen. Talmadge, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to prohibit the charging of certain fees there-under; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks of author p. S13959
28. PERSONNEL. H. R. 13252 by Rep. Matsunaga, to amend section 8332, title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
29. BUILDINGS. H. R. 13261 by Rep. Hebert, to provide for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings; to Public Works Committee.
30. FOOD LABELING. H. Con. Res. 516 by Rep. Denney, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to certain proposed regulations of the Food and Drug Administration relating to the labeling and content of diet foods and diet supplements; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

31. DAIRY INDEMNITY. S. 1657, to extend until June 30, 1968, the legislative authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who, through no fault of their own, have their milk removed from commercial markets because it has been contaminated by residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government. Approved Sept. 28, 1967 (Public Law 90-95).
32. APPROPRIATIONS. H. R. 10738, the Department of Defense appropriations bill, 1968. Approved Sept. 29, 1967 (Public Law 90-96).

D

COMMITTEE HEARINGS:

- OCT. 3: Export payments for tobacco producers who disapproved quotas, H. Agriculture (Turner, ASCS, to testify).
Pay bill, H. Rules and S. Civil Service.
Foreign aid authorization, conferees (exec).
- OCT. 10: Personnel benefits for county committee employees, H. Civil Service (Fitzgerald, ASCS, to testify).

oOo

tionary pressures which his system has been helping to generate. In the face of a mounting Federal deficit, Federal policy should have been neutral during the first half of 1967, and restrictive from mid-year on.

If Federal Reserve policy were reversed and average free reserves of the member banks were reduced from the present plus \$275 million to a minus \$400 million figure by a tight-money policy, no tax increase would be necessary.

A tax increase isn't needed at this time and once imposed is difficult to reverse. Federal Reserve policy is much more flexible if used intelligently.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement reached on Friday last, the pending business is amendment No. 341, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the debate is limited to 2 hours to be divided equally and controlled by the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR COOPER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that—withstanding the unanimous-consent agreement, that Amendment No. 341, offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], be the pending business—the distinguished Senator from Kentucky be recognized for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, President Johnson said in his comprehensive statement of the administration's position on Vietnam last Friday evening that peace lies with Hanoi. One statement was:

It is by Hanoi's choice, not ours, not the world's, that the war continues.

I cannot agree. I do not criticize my country, but fact and reason dictate that the first step toward negotiations and peace—the unconditional cessation of the

bombing of North Vietnam—lies now in the choice and control of our country.

The reasons which lead the North Vietnamese, in my view, to ask for the unconditional cessation of bombing, the growing support of this requirement by friend as well as foe, lead to the conclusion that there is little hope for negotiations and for a just settlement of the war in Vietnam until the United States takes this first step—the cessation of its bombing of North Vietnam.

This has been my judgment since the bombing started in 1965. It is a judgment which I expressed first in March 1965, when the bombing commenced, and later in January 1966, after I had returned from Vietnam, and in several speeches in the Senate this year. It is a judgment that I have expressed to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State since that time.

I speak today because there are new situations which cause me to urge again this course of action.

The first is the possibility of the assistance of the United Nations, or of its member states, during its session in New York. The strong and consistent position of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]—a man whom we all respect and admire—that the issue of Vietnam should be submitted by the United States to the Security Council without reservation, and if the Security Council will not act, to the General Assembly, has received wide support in the Congress and throughout our country.

The distinguished majority leader is correct in holding that the United Nations should assume jurisdiction and satisfy its chief reason for existence, that of maintaining peace, whatever the obstacles may be. The United Nations should assume jurisdiction, but if it does not, the presence of representatives of concerned countries at the United Nations provides an unusual opportunity for private discussions and negotiations—an opportunity which will not be easily available after the session has adjourned.

We may note, while jurisdiction has not yet been assumed, that the chief burden of practically every speech of representatives of the members of the United Nations; speaking in the General Assembly, has been the war in Vietnam.

There is a second reason which leads me to speak today. We are on the eve of a national election—one of the great events in American political life—and the campaign debate is already underway.

Vietnam will inevitably be an issue, for it is the greatest problem and concern of our country. It would be strange indeed if it were not an issue in the coming campaign. Parties and candidates will take positions and the people will make their decisions upon policies and the course of the war in Vietnam.

We know that in the heat of the campaign when emotions are aroused, politics may for a time override the reasonable debate of policy, and the opportunity for a settlement of the war may be postponed until after the election next November. I do not want this to happen. I do not speak politically today, for the war with

all its problems and burdens is the concern of all our people.

No one can say whether this will cause a postponement of a settlement of the war, but if it does, we know that in the intervening period until November 1968, a heavy price will be paid by the young men of our country and the peoples of South and North Vietnam. And in that period, the dangers of an expanded war will not be lessened.

We have all been in politics; we have all been in campaigns. Many of us have participated, one way or another, in presidential campaigns. I believe we will all agree that there will be less possibility of a settlement of this war during the campaign year.

The cessation of bombing is a difficult decision for the President to make. It involves a change in present policy, but such a change would be consistent with the President's speech at Johns Hopkins in April 1965, in which he stated that the United States would be willing to enter negotiations unconditionally. Admittedly, the cessation of bombing might not result in negotiations, and admittedly it involves some immediate risk to the security of our forces in Vietnam. But the possibility of a cease-fire, negotiations, and a settlement based upon the determination of the people of North and South Vietnam far outweighs any risk.

It is in this sense that I believe the issue of negotiations and of peace in South Vietnam lies now with the administration and with our country.

Now I should like to direct my attention to some questions and criticisms that have been raised regarding the proposal to cease bombing. It is correct and proper that questions should be asked and criticisms should be raised on such a vital issue.

I am aware that it can be said that the plea for a cessation of bombing expresses only a hope. I do not believe it is only a hope. Fact and reason are the basis of my support and my appeal for the cessation of bombing.

We must take into account the long record of North Vietnam's requirements for an unconditional cessation of bombing. As escalation has increased, its government has presented to the United States additional and harsher requirements; but the continuing condition, without variation, has been the cessation of bombing.

Ho Chi Minh's response to President Johnson's letter of February 10 of this year, in which he asserted the full list, the old list, of requirements, appeared to foreclose the President's offer; but it ended with these words:

It is only after the unconditional cessation of United States bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam that the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States could enter into talks and discuss questions concerning the two sides.

The Vietnamese people will never submit to force, they will never accept talks under the threat of bombs.

Our cause is absolutely just. It is to be hoped that the United States Government will act in accordance with reason.

Recently, after the speech of Ambassador Goldberg—and it was a very good speech—in the United Nations, the re-

sponse of Hanoi, through its press, appeared inflexible. But again, the same theme—the cessation of bombing—was emphasized.

North Vietnam's requirement undoubtedly is based upon its view that the United States has, by its bombing, invaded and aggressed against its territory and its people. We do not have to accept as correct this reasoning of North Vietnam, but we have to consider it. I believe that commonsense informs us that a people who would not surrender to the French or to the Japanese, and again to the French after World War II, and a Communist government allied with Communist China and the Soviet Union, will not negotiate under the threat of bombing, which they consider to be an ultimatum to come to the conference table or to surrender. In fact, some of our military leaders have said that the purpose of our bombing is to compel the North Vietnamese to come to the conference table.

We must take into consideration, also, the reasoning and the opinion of other countries and peoples of the world. U Thant, the Secretary General of the United Nations, recently said again, categorically, that if bombing should stop, negotiations would occur shortly. Mr. Kosygin, according to the report of the Department of State, told President Johnson, at Glassboro, that negotiations would ensue if the bombing stopped. It is hardly likely that the representative of the U.S.S.R. speaking to the President, would make this statement without authority. At the United Nations, in growing chorus, the representatives of member states have taken the same position. It may be that their statements express a hope, but they are made by men experienced in world affairs, experienced in negotiation, and they speak for their governments. The necessity of a cessation of bombing is becoming a worldwide judgment. It is one which the United States cannot afford to ignore.

I hope the President will take counsel from such an international consensus and from the countries which are our friends. Such a friend as Canada, speaking through its Minister of External Affairs, Paul Martin, has said:

It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped.

I believe, also, that the President can take counsel from those in Congress and throughout the country who have maintained this position for a long time, not from any doubt of the strength of our country or doubt of the good intentions of the President, but upon the basis of fact and reason.

Now I direct my attention to other questions that are asked, and they are proper questions. Many questions necessarily must be raised and faced by the Government, by the President, and by those of us who propose this alternative course, if the cessation of bombing were not followed by negotiations.

Would the failure of negotiations endanger the security of our forces?

Would the resumption of bombing be required?

Would the failure of negotiations lead to the hardening of the positions of the parties and a long and expanded war?

Would a failure of negotiations, harden the positions of the parties and lead to a larger danger—the intervention of Communist China and a larger participation by the Soviet Union?

I should like to answer these questions for myself.

The reasons which support a cessation of bombing would in my view be applicable to the policy we should follow if negotiations do not ensue immediately. If negotiations should not follow, I believe our policy should then be to confine military action to South Vietnam along with the cessation of bombing it would be the best means of preventing a long and expanded war, and the best means of ultimately securing negotiations.

This is not a position I have taken recently. In 1965, in debate in the Senate Chamber, I said that the cessation of bombing and the confinement of the battleground to South Vietnam were the best means of preventing an expansion of the war and preventing the possible intervention of Communist China and the Soviet Union.

The necessity for such a new policy is supported by the record of our present policy. Since bombing began in 1966 the infiltration of men and supplies from North Vietnam has increased, as have the activities of the Vietcong. Our forces have grown from nearly 24,000 to over 500,000. This does not take into account those forces which are on the perimeter of Vietnam, our naval forces; or Thailand, Japan, and the Philippines, who together are engaged in support of our forces in Vietnam.

The increase of our forces to over 500,000 men and massive bombing, the weight of which is larger than the bombing in World War II, has not halted the infiltration of men and supplies from the north. We must ask if this vast expansion of the war in 2½ years is a consequence of our bombing, rather than as the Administration says, that bombing has been required because of the expansion of the war.

I believe it is our bombing which has caused vast expansion of the war.

Since the bombing of North Vietnam began, the Soviet Union has stepped up its supply of arms including sophisticated weapons, and recently it has promised additional aid and volunteers, if necessary. The Soviet Union considers North Vietnam its ally which it must aid, as we consider South Vietnam an ally which we must aid.

Again, we must ask if this increased supply from the Soviet Union and the provision of sophisticated weapons is a result of our bombing, and whether confinement of the battleground to South Vietnam would result in a reduction or a cutoff of the Soviet Union's supplies to North Vietnam. It would be an important means of determining the intentions of the Soviet Union in Vietnam and, indeed, their intention toward the United States in the difficult problems which engage our two countries.

It is tragically clear also that the extension of the war to North Vietnam has not strengthened the security of our forces. Since the bombing started the casualty lists have gone up from a few hundred until today the number killed

is over 13,000, and the number wounded is over 88,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Now, with this record, can it be said that it would endanger the security of our forces if we should cease the bombing and confine the battleground to South Vietnam?

It is difficult for me to believe that if we change our policy to one of deescalation, that the United States, with its vast array of arms and power could not protect our forces effectively and do so even better than today. Our vast power could be concentrated where needed in support of our troops and at the points where infiltration routes from the north enter South Vietnam.

I have raised these questions as to whether the proposal to cease bombing is simply one of hope, and what situations might result if negotiations did not ensue, for they are proper questions and they must be answered.

But my chief purpose for speaking today in support of this proposal, as I have urged for two and a half years, is to press for cessation of bombing, as a means to determine if the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong will respond—and whether the war can be brought to an end. If the war does not, then I believe that confinement of the war to South Vietnam would reverse the present dangerous expansion of the war and lead ultimately, if not immediately, to its end.

We cannot foresee every eventuality. I argue today that we should take steps which will reduce the conflict or which we can hope will lead to its settlement rather than to continue a course of action which promises thus far no settlement except by the arbitrament of war.

I do not attempt to lay out specific policies that United States should pursue if negotiations occur. I believe our objectives for the people of South Vietnam are worthy, but I believe also that the ability of the United States to determine the course of another country is limited. As the people of North Vietnam and, indeed, of South Vietnam would resist domination by the United States, they will resist domination by the Communist Chinese. This is borne out by the history of their long struggle against the French, Japan, and China. In the event of negotiations and any settlement, it is likely that an international body, and most likely the Geneva Conference, could provide time and opportunity for the people of South Vietnam and North Vietnam to determine the form of government and society they desire. We hope that it will be a choice of democratic values, but their people must make the choice.

It is clear that the United States, with all its vast power, its good and noble intentions, cannot prescribe the affairs of another country. We cannot intervene throughout the world unless our national security or freedom in the world is truly affected. We can be of assistance. We can support the processes of world order and law, we can provide effective economic aid and, above all, we can set an

Oct. 3, 1967

- 3 -

tax-exempt cooperatives" and have expanded into fields only "partially related to agriculture" and inserted one such testimony. pp. H12904-7

12. RECREATION. Received from the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission a resolution recommending the establishment of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. p. H12916

SENATE

13. POVERTY. Continued debate on S. 2388, the poverty bill (pp. S14023, S14024-31, S14039-49, S14051-55, S14091-114). Rejected, 49-30, an amendment by Sen. Curtis to repeal the Job Corps and provide authorization for vocational education (pp. S14024-31); and 73-14, a Ribicoff-Percy amendment to include a substitute title II "Emergency Employment Act of 1967" (pp. S14039-49). A Prouty-Scott amendment to recommit the bill with instructions to report back with certain changes in title II was pending at adjournment (pp. S14091-114).

Sen. McGee inserted what he described as a concise self-evaluation of the poverty programs which are carried on among certain Indians. p. S14084

14. APPROPRIATIONS. Reported with amendments H. R. 12474, the NASA appropriations bill, 1968 (S. Rept. 579). p. S14065

Sen. Proxmire submitted a proposed amendment to H. R. 11456, the Department of Transportation appropriation bill, 1968. p. S14065

15. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1320, to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government (pp. S14050-1). This bill will now be sent to the President.

16. FARM PRICES. Sen. McGovern said he hoped "no one will have the audacity to blame rising farm prices for any increases which may be made in retail food costs," and inserted an article "Inflationary Influences Mount Despite Drop in Price Indexes." pp. S14068-9

17. SOCIAL SECURITY. Sen. Randolph submitted proposed amendments to H. R. 12080, the Social Security Act amendments bill. p. S14065

18. BEEF INDUSTRY. Cosponsors were added to S. 2226, to provide for an annual conference between representatives of the beef industry, the Secretary of Agriculture, and representatives of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to consider problems relating to the export of beef and beef products from the U. S., and related international trade problems. pp. S14067-8

19. FOREIGN POLICY. Sen. Gruening inserted magazine articles critical of U. S. foreign policy. pp. S14070-1

20. METRIC SYSTEM. Sen. Pell commended and inserted an article on the feasibility of the metric system of weights and measures. pp. S14072-3

21. PROCUREMENT. Sen. Gruening commended and inserted Sen. Morse' remarks at a workshop on Government contracts and procurement. pp. S14073-5
Sen. Proxmire inserted a Defense Department memorandum which he said establishes a policy which will "plug a gaping hole in its procurement procedures, which has been costing the taxpayers millions of dollars a year in overcharges on defense contracts." pp. S14077-8

22. ANIMAL RESEARCH. Sens. Clark and Monroney spoke in opposition to self-policing of animal-care facilities. pp. S14078, S14079-80
23. FEDERAL SPENDING; TAXATION. Sen. Proxmire stated that Congress needs help in determining relative priorities of different programs if it is to control Federal spending effectively. p. S14079
- Sen. Proxmire inserted a newspaper editorial commenting that the proposed tax hike will not do the anti-inflationary job. pp. S14083-4
- Sen. Bennett urged that the Government exercise restraint in Federal spending. p. S14086
- Sen. Hartke inserted an address by a McGraw-Hill, Inc., economist opposing the proposed tax increase. pp. S14088-90

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. URBAN AFFAIRS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Everett favoring Rep. Evins bill designed to create employment opportunities in smaller cities. p. A4885
- Extension of remarks of Rep. Fraser stating that "Two men who have thought deeply and spoken intelligently on the need for improving rural life are Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and Vice President Humphrey", and inserting the Vice President's speech on this subject. pp. A4901-2
- Rep. Ullman commended and inserted Secretary Freeman's speech at a Roosevelt Kennedy Memorial Dinner. pp. A4886-8
25. FOOD FOR PEACE. Rep. Denney inserted an American Legion resolution supporting the "broad stated purposes" of the Food for Peace Act. p. A4893
26. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Adair inserted an article on related questions of a possible Federal tax increase and our efforts to reduce governmental expenditures. pp. A4894-5
27. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Daddario inserted an article, "Tariff Concessions Affect Over \$16 Billion in Trade." pp. A4900-1

BILLS INTRODUCED

28. TEXTILE IMPORTS. H. R. 13274 by Rep. Langen and H. R. 13292 by Rep. Mize, to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to Ways and Means Committee. Remarks of Rep. Langen, p. H12891
29. PATENTS. S. J. Res. 114 by Sen. McClellan, extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases; to Judiciary Committee. Remarks of author p. S14067
30. HOLIDAYS. H. R. 13282 by Rep. Feighan, declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to Judiciary Committee.
31. EMPLOYMENT. H. R. 13283 by Rep. Halpern, relative to age discrimination in employment; to Education and Labor Committee.
32. SCHOOL LUNCH. H. R. 13293 by Rep. Vanik, to amend the National School Lunch Act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children; to Education and Labor Committee. Remarks of author pp. H12908-10



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 113

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1967

No. 157

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, October 2, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Dr. Ralph John, president, Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou in whose providence we find the time and substance of life, and before whom the nations rise and fall: Prompted by those who have gone before, and compelled by our own needs, we look to Thee for wisdom and strength sufficient for the demands of this place and age.

Frequently frustrated by the complexities of a world which recurrently defies simplification, and with hearts burdened by the errant impulses of a humanity which has not caught the vision of its common ground in Thy love, we ask Thy guidance for the living of these days. Make us perceptive in appraisal, courageous in advocacy, and above all, committed to Thy will and way. So may we claim our destiny as a nation, and Thy Kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, October 2, 1967, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide and improve the Economic

Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how does the time stand?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is divided between the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. DIRKSEN. And how much time remains?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An hour on each side.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Missouri on a nongermane subject.

A PROPOSAL LOOKING TOWARD PEACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday, for some hours, there was discussion on the Senate floor about the war in Vietnam, with many Senators on both sides of the aisle recommending that the United States cease the part of the war in which this country has definite superiority; but no recommendations with respect to that part in which our superiority is clearly more in question.

In the Washington Post this morning, an editorial entitled "The Lesson of Con Thien" is especially interesting to me because I was in the Con Thien area a few days ago.

The editorial illustrates only too well "the perils and pitfalls and hard disciplines of limited war," now limited to the point where the already heavy casualties to U.S. forces are increasing; limited to the point where the prestige of this country is being affected, all over the world.

Nevertheless, as evidenced yesterday, some are now demanding that the war be still more limited.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have just returned from a trip to the Far East, Middle East, and Europe, having visited Japan, Hong Kong, South Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Israel, Greece, Italy, and Great Britain.

A report of findings and conclusions will be made shortly to the chairmen of the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees. In the meantime, however, one can only view with increased apprehension both the nature and the extent of the current worldwide commitments of the United States.

In Vietnam the pot has boiled over. In other countries where we have binding commitments, however, the water also is becoming very warm indeed.

In this connection, one notes the strange paradox of the brilliant military victory recently achieved by Israel against sophisticated Soviet weaponry nevertheless resulting in a much improved Soviet position in the Middle East; because both the United Arab Republic and Syria were left so weak militarily they can only hope to be rearmed by the Soviet on the latter's terms—said rearmament is proceeding rapidly, to the point where 70 percent of their air equipment losses have now been replaced.

The Soviet position is also improving steadily in the western Mediterranean. Today Algeria is probably the strongest Arab country in their orbit; and if there is any truth in the rumor that General de Gaulle plans to turn over to Algeria the great naval base of Mers el Kebir, the Soviets will obtain further significant leverage in that part of the Mediterranean.

Such a development would, in effect, turn the southern flank of SHAPE; and the original concept of NATO, already heavily damaged in the center by the withdrawal of France, would be weakened still further.

The resources of any country, even those of the United States, are not inexhaustible; and therefore these developments in the Middle East and Europe should also be considered as we in turn

consider future policies incident to Vietnam.

I have presented for many months my conviction that the United States is over-committed and overextended on a unilateral basis. We need a great deal of money to handle all these foreign commitments along with our growing problems at home, and we do not want to jeopardize the integrity of the dollar.

In addition, and most important, is the matter of American lives. In this latter connection, the campaign here to cease air attacks against North Vietnam is receiving full attention in the other countries. But all civilian and military people abroad confirm the sworn testimony before the Committee on Armed Services. All those with whom I discussed this matter warn that another cessation of the raids against North Vietnam would guarantee additional casualties in South Vietnam—13,500 Americans have already been killed, 85,000 wounded.

Instead of only another cessation in the air attacks against North Vietnam, therefore, I propose that this Government announce, as of a certain date, the cessation of all military action in South Vietnam as well as over North Vietnam; and also announce that there will be no reinforcements into the theater.

The Government would announce that these policies were being undertaken in earnest hope that their adoption would result in prompt and meaningful negotiations in the interest of a just peace.

At the same time, the United States should also announce that, if after this cessation of all military action in South Vietnam, as well as North Vietnam, the North Vietnamese, and Vietcong nevertheless continued hostilities, then the United States would feel free to pursue this war in any manner of its own choosing.

It would appear that the political objectives of the United States have now been achieved through the creation, by means of free elections, of the present Saigon Government; and the military objectives of this Government have never included the invasion of North Vietnam, the occupation of Hanoi, or the taking over of the Government of North Vietnam.

Concurrently with the above proposed announcement of U.S. policy, the Government of South Vietnam should announce its willingness to negotiate with anybody, and offer amnesty to members of the Vietcong.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.), Post, Oct. 3, 1967]

THE LESSON OF CONTHIEN

The story of Conthien is the story of the Vietnam War. There is the same sense of stalemate and seemingly senseless bloodshed, the grinding attrition to no apparent or decisive purpose, the cruel inhibitions on our fighting men. And there are the same, perfectly normal, strictly conventional military reflexes at work—reflexes which have confounded so much of the conduct of this essentially abnormal and unconventional conflict. Indeed, the story of Conthien is not just in the spectacle of brave men dug in under a heavy handicap. It is in the spectacle of a limited war threatening to become a wider war because of a temptation to forget that our war purposes are limited.

This is the lesson of Conthien. It is not Dien Bien Phu, or the Chosin Reservoir, or Verdun. Like almost everything else about Vietnam, it is without precise precedent. We can abandon it (which the French could not at Dien Bien Phu). It is not, by most estimates, of critical military significance. If it is rapidly acquiring political and psychological significance, that is in large part because we ourselves are making it a symbol of something—our resolve, our military prowess, our courage—which it need not be. All these have been amply attested to in Vietnam, and will be soon enough again. Nor does the honor of the United States Marines need vindication at Conthien. In a war of attrition, to use General Westmoreland's phrase, Conthien has played its part, for the Marines have taken the enemy's worst and returned it manyfold.

Can it be that the sticking-point is mere territory? To accept this is to renounce a large part of what we have learned in the hardest kind of way in Vietnam about the conduct of "counter-insurgency" war. We are fighting to destroy enemy main forces, to help clear areas of guerrilla units, to expand security in populated areas—in short, to prevent the freedom of choice of the South Vietnamese from being foreclosed by force. None of this obliges us to conquer and hold a particular desolated strip of unpopulated territory.

A very good military case can be made, in fact, for the Marines pulling their base camps and prepared positions back out of range of heavy Communist artillery all across the DMZ. If the North Vietnamese bring their guns and rockets down into South Vietnamese territory, they can be dealt with on the ground without adding the new dimension to the war of a ground invasion of North Vietnam.

There is another compelling argument for doing so. Where the United States troops, and those of South Vietnam, take their stand in the northern slice of South Vietnam will very much determine where the so-called "barrier" against infiltration will be built. There is some military logic in having this defensive position also out of the range of Communist artillery over the border in North Vietnam.

Psychologically, this would seem to surrender a slim strip of South Vietnamese real estate to the North. In effect, however, we have been surrendering large chunks of the highlands and the War Zones to the enemy at one time or another all along. Search and destroy operations against mass concentrations of enemy troops and small patrols would still continue north of whatever positions the Marines might pull back to.

To state the case for pulling back is not to say flatly that this must be done. It may be that the Marines can hold out indefinitely and reduce their casualties by more effective counter-battery fire or deeper entrenchments. What would be indefensible, however, would be a prolonged defense of Conthien at the cost of heavy losses out of misplaced pride. Worse would be a stubborn defense finally impelling a ground attack over the border that would remove one more inhibition against a wider war.

If Conthien is to be a test of anything beyond the gallantry of our fighting men, it should be a test, not of our resolve, which does not need such testing but of our restraint. The lesson of Conthien lies in what it tells us of the perils and pitfalls and hard disciplines of limited war.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to come out of neither side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, rather fortunately this amendment has been pending for some time and my basic statement has been available to Senators in their offices and on their desks. I realize that at this unusual hour, with committee meetings and other responsibilities of Senators, what I am saying here is largely for the RECORD.

I have offered this amendment because I am interested in the untrained having an opportunity for training and becoming productive members of our society. I believe that what I have proposed will do a far better job than the Job Corps.

My amendment is easily understood. It would repeal the Job Corps. In lieu thereof, we add \$195 million to the authorization for vocational and technical training under the 1963 act. This would double the amount of money going to each State for this purpose, if the amount provided in my amendment is authorized and appropriated.

Now, it stands out clearly and without dispute that this proposal would save \$100 million annually. In addition, the cost of operating the Job Corps is excessive. I think it is not subject to dispute that training in a vocational and technical school which is run by a State can be given at far less cost. I have estimated that it costs 2½ times as much to keep an enrollee in the Job Corps as it costs to keep a young man or young woman in a vocational or technical school that is a part of the State educational system.

When the Federal Government spends money for vocational education under the 1963 act, the States and localities have to match it; so for every sum of money spent increasing vocational and technical training by the Federal Government, as compared with the same amount of money given to the Job Corps, this expenditure would reach five times as many people.

Mr. President, here is a chance for the Senate to get rid of one bureau, reach five times as many people with better training, and save \$100 million annually.

One argument that pops up is: The very, very unfortunate people who are recruited for the Job Corps will not be reached by the State vocational and technical training courses. I say that argument is without foundation. I say they are not being reached by the Job Corps. The Job Corps is picking up a few

people here and there, flying them all around the country, flying them home for Christmas, flying supervisors here and there, and that is where the taxpayers' money goes.

Can anyone here tell us what happens to 75 percent of those enrollees when they leave the Job Corps? The fact of the matter is that the Job Corps is not making a dent in the problem of unfortunate people who are untrained and who live in undesirable areas, whether we call those areas slums or ghettos.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, what greater incentive could Government provide than to have well-run vocational and technical schools right in the midst of the ghettos? Can Government set a better example? They cannot. This is the right way to do it.

In addition, Mr. President, there is a part of this problem that is beyond the Government. Government must provide the schools, but the character within the people to want to be self-sustaining, to want to provide for their families, to want to amount to something, cannot be accomplished by appropriations or by the passage of a law. We will have to turn to the spiritual institutions and character-building institutions of the country in order to carry out that function.

I point out that whenever State and local people are brought into an operation of training the untrained, we get some forces that cannot be supplied by a bureaucracy running the whole show.

Mr. President, it is shameful the way in which bureaucracies are lobbying to perpetuate themselves. The time and energy high people in this agency are spending to promote the perpetuation of their own empire is shameful.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. Let us take a look at what it would do.

The Curtis amendment would repeal outright the present Job Corps establishment without making any provisions for its orderly liquidation. This would mean that \$144 million in facilities would be abandoned, with no opportunity to work out in an orderly way what is to become of them. It would mean that \$18 million in corpsmen allotments to their families—mothers, wives, sisters and brothers—would not be sent home because they would not have the money out of which the allotments could be paid.

It would mean that \$23 million in conservation work would go undone. This, I think, is of as much significance to States in the East, such as Pennsylvania, where we have untold work which can be done in the Allegheny National Park, in Fairmont Park in Philadelphia, and State game and fish lands, as it is to a State like Montana. The present occupant of the chair is well aware that there

are inadequacies in appropriations for our national parks and national forests and an enormous amount of useful conservation work which has been backlogged for many a year.

Adoption of the Curtis amendment would mean that 80,000 deprived youth would not be served.

These are poor people. It would mean that the economic impact on 123 communities in 38 States where centers are operating and bringing money into communities and increasing the wealth of the inhabitants, these benefits would be lost. It would mean that over 125 million dollars in contracts with private industry would be terminated.

For, let us remember that a substantial part of the Job Corps' operations is under contract to private industry which is doing it for profit. Lytton Industries, Packard Bell, the brains of private industry in the management field, have been brought to bear on the Job Corps under a profit arrangement. All this would be lost in order to terminate the Job Corps program and substitute for it a middle class program, a program for the children of individuals who, in the ordinary course of events, are able to provide for their boys and girls, to send them to vocational educational schools, and see to it, if necessary, that they have the money for dormitories and food away from home.

But this program is directed to the poor, not to the middle class. This is a poverty bill. This is not a bill to improve the educational opportunities of middle-class American boys and girls.

That is taken care of in the Primary, Secondary, and Higher Education Act.

This is a bill for the poor.

This amendment would strike at the heart of one of the most important and one of the most successful programs to take young boys and girls off the streets and bring them into a healthy environment, to give them medical and dental services, to give them the kind of character building training which will turn potential juvenile delinquents into useful citizens.

This is a program which did, I will admit, have a shaky beginning, but now most of the bugs have been removed and 42,000 young people are benefiting from the program, with 70 percent of them getting jobs when they complete the program. All this would be cut away, at one fell swoop, if the Curtis amendment should be agreed to.

Mention is made of the fact that the Curtis amendment would cut costs.

Of course it would cut costs. Why would it not? It deals only with the training aspects of the rehabilitation program. Most kids who go to a vocational school do not need any particular extra training in character and in attitude. That is where at least 50 percent of the money spent on the Job Corps goes, to make good citizens out of disadvantaged youth.

Thus, necessarily, if we dismiss the whole problem of character and attitude, as my friend from Nebraska has done, surely, it will save costs. But the problem will remain. Is it not worth the cost to redeem the youth of this country through service in the Job Corps in 38 States—coming from all 50 States? Is this not

well worth the cost which, to be sure, is not low?

The program suggested by my friend from Nebraska is aimed at only half the problem, as I just said, and hence requires only half the cost. But what lies at the heart of the poverty program is the total rehabilitation of these youngsters. This is basic economics. It must also follow that we will have available for each of the young persons only one-half of what needs to be done, if the Curtis amendment should be adopted.

Why did these young people not respond to vocational schools in the first place?

They had the opportunity if they had the money—and all too often they did not have the money—to go to school as part of their secondary education, but they did not respond because they needed something else. In many cases, they needed a full stomach, a warm room, an understanding person to direct them towards the right way to achieve the good things in American life which they are being denied today. It was to give them these services, not as a matter of charity but as a matter of right that the Job Corps was established, in the first place, to give the youngsters a different environment. That is why the Job Corps fixed their teeth, gave them comprehensive physical examinations, performed hernia operations, put glasses on their eyes when they could not see, and provided a healthy diet to renew a body too long victimized by poor nutrition.

None of this can be done by turning half the money over to vocational schools. Not until these things are done can a young boy or girl begin to concentrate on a vocational career.

Human renewal is not cheap. Those of us fortunate enough to provide for our children from the moment they are born, through college and sometimes to graduate school, know the expense involved. To take a youngster who has not been so fortunate as ours and try to make a contributing citizen out of him is expensive.

It is also claimed that the local community from which a Job Corps youngster has been recruited seldom benefits from the time, money, and training that has been afforded the individual enrollee. May I suggest we take a look at the record.

Here are some figures about the Job Corps as of June 1967—about 3 months ago—the figures would be higher now.

There are 11 States in which Job Corps centers to this date has not been established. That means that there are Job Corps centers in 39 of the 50 States.

Although no Federal funds have gone into these States for construction and maintenance of Job Corps centers, these States have benefited from the allotments to dependents and readjustment allowances which are brought back with the Corps member to the State from which he was recruited.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield at that point for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. What are the 11 States which do not have Job Corps centers?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be glad to obtain that for the Senator a little bit later. I do not have it on the tip of my tongue.

Mr. President, in this respect, the State of Louisiana has benefited to the extent of \$2,114,583; the State of Mississippi to the extent of \$1,783,507; Alabama by \$1,988,480; Georgia by \$2,357,997; and South Carolina by \$1,833,766. And these figures reflect only the monetary benefits, above the training and new skills which the Corps members bring back to their States.

The goal of the Job Corps is to prepare young men and women for jobs in which they can earn a decent living and through which they can become responsible citizens.

To illustrate my point, let us talk for a moment about the typical Job Corps enrollee.

He has had 8 years of school but he reads only at the fourth-grade level. That is because he has not been able to absorb his education properly—frequently because his ghetto school is no good.

Forty-seven percent of the males failed the induction eligibility test for the Armed Forces—33 percent failed for educational reasons; 60 percent from broken homes; 63 percent from homes where the head of the household is unemployed.

Almost 40 percent come from families on relief, and 80 percent have not seen a doctor or dentist in the last 10 years. What chance would these youngsters have in a vocational educational system? I suggest none. That is why the Curtis amendment is not a program for poor people. It is a program for middle class children, a program for children who have already had most of the amenities of life.

We know that for every 10 months spent in the Job Corps, the average Corps member gains 1½ grade levels in reading. This is over twice the gain he showed in public school before he dropped out.

Seventy percent of all Job Corpsmen obtain jobs, or reenter schools, or qualify and enter the military service. Those who have jobs receive wages of \$1.71 an hour. If we assume this youngster works at \$1.71 an hour for 40 years with no increase in earnings, he will return to the Government in income tax payments alone over \$11,200.

To talk of the Job Corps as a vocational program is just not to understand the average Job Corpsman whom I have just described. He could no more go to a vocational school, live independently in a dormitory, pay for his room and board, read his vocational manuals, than he could enter college. A vocational program alone is too far above him educationally and emotionally, and, I would say, culturally. This youngster needs complete human renewal, and that is what the Job Corps does.

So I think in essence the question in determining the vote on the Curtis amendment is: Do we want a poverty program or do we want to put more money into middle class education? We are putting plenty of money into middle class education. I have supported it in many bills of which I have been proud to be a cosponsor.

Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used 12 minutes of his 60 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I will yield myself, again, such time as I may require.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to say a word about Job Corps costs, and here I refer to the committee report, page 14, which states that the committee has conferred with a number of Job Corps contractors, including those from industrial firms which have had long experience in cost cutting methods. They conclude that costs are reaching rock bottom and cannot be further lowered without seriously impairing program quality. Center managers have expressed shock on learning the depth of disadvantage of the youths who enroll in the Job Corps.

Mr. President, mark this well: Remedial medical and dental services alone cost \$360 per enrollee. That is because these youngsters have not had a chance to have adequate medical and dental care because of the cost involved.

The seemingly high costs are necessary to remedy 16 to 20 years of neglect by local schools—whether they be in the humanities or technical or vocational schools—neglect by health agencies, and other community service organizations, and to overcome the handicaps of broken families and disrupted neighborhood life.

Indeed, costs are high, but the needs are great. Yet the committee is convinced that, in the long run, the Government will be fully reimbursed for these expenditures through the taxes derived from the corpsmen's subsequent greater earnings, not to speak of the savings to the welfare and correctional systems of the country as these youngsters are assisted in finding productive roles in society.

A comment was made, in the course of the debate, that—

Nationally, the Job Corps is in disrepute. It does not have the confidence of the American people. These weaknesses and failures are common knowledge and they have been well documented over the months.

I categorically deny that statement. There is not one word of truth in it. Of the more than 400 witnesses who testified before the subcommittee, only two advocated the abolition of OEO and the transfer of its functions, including the Job Corps, to other agencies. These witnesses included key representatives from such important national organizations as the following:

National League of Cities.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors.

National Association for Community Development.

National Urban League.

League of Women Voters.

National Council of Churches.

National Council of Jewish Women.

National Conference of Senior Citizens.

National Council of Catholic Women.

American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.

And the American Bar Association—surely not a radical organization.

All of these groups have supported the maintenance of the Job Corps within OEO, and, in fact, many have recommended an expansion of the program.

In addition, the business community has become increasingly more receptive toward the OEO programs, and the Job Corps in particular, and plays a leading role in the operation of the Job Corps camps, as I noted a moment or two ago.

My friend from Nebraska said:

Nobody has an accurate check as to what happens to the Job Corps enrollees after they leave the Job Corps.

There is not a word of truth in that statement. Let me read from the committee report, at page 13:

Based upon sample studies conducted for OEO by Louis Harris & Associates, the Job Corps estimates that 70 percent who have left the Job Corps are working, in the armed services, or enrolled in school. The remaining 30 percent were unemployed, out of the labor force (such as young women who married), or whereabouts unknown.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, I yield. Before the Senator begins, may I say to him that I can give him the list of States where there are no Job Corps camps. I asked my staff to get that information.

Mr. CURTIS. I am neither offended nor stirred over the fact that the Senator stated that the statements in my speech were without a word of truth in them. Of course, nobody believes that absurd and ridiculous charge.

Mr. CLARK. I yielded for a question, if the Senator wishes to ask a question.

Mr. CURTIS. I told the Senator that I interviewed three of the top leaders of the Job Corps and I asked them what happens to people who leave the Job Corps and they told me that they had no way of finding out because they write them at the address when they enrolled, and when they are gone from there they have no check on any of them, but about 25 or 30 percent—

Mr. CLARK. Is the Senator referring to the Job Corps center in Nebraska?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Because the information is here in the National Office of OEO.

It may be that they do not have the information in Nebraska. In fact, when we talked to them the other day they seemed to be singularly confused. These are figures we got from Mr. Shriver.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Shriver is fighting the battle of his life to save his bureaucracy. I challenge Mr. Shriver to give a list of the figures based on Government figures showing where they are working right now.

Mr. CLARK. May I read into the RECORD the list of States where there are no camps?

Alabama, Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Rhode Island, and South Carolina.

Mr. President, studies made by Louis Harris, to which I referred a moment ago, are in the House hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967, part I. The hearings were held from June 12 to 16. I hold in my hand a copy, which I shall be glad to furnish to the Senator from Nebraska if he cares to look at it.

Mr. CURTIS. That is an opinion poll; is it not?

Mr. CLARK. No; it is a check, to see where they are. It is not an opinion poll.

Mr. CURTIS. It is merely a poll taken by a pollster.

I still challenge Sargent Shriver to tell what happened to the people who were trained in the Job Corps. He has no record of them.

Mr. CLARK. All I can say is that if the Senator from Nebraska does not believe Sargent Shriver, perhaps he will believe Lou Harris.

Mr. CURTIS. No, I did not say I do not believe him; I said he did not have the information.

Mr. CLARK. He told us he did.

Mr. CURTIS. Why does he not present it?

Mr. CLARK. He did before our committee. I just read it to the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. No; he gave a pollster's opinion.

Mr. CLARK. I cannot agree with my good friend from Nebraska. What was given us was an analysis made by his own assistants.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska commented about Job Corpsmen being flown all over the country and taking over hotels. The answer to that criticism is that during the early years of the Job Corps, it was the custom of the Job Corps to fly enrollees from their reception centers, where they were gathered, out to the conservation camps in the West. This was felt to be the most economic way to handle them, but Congress did not like it, so in 1966 Congress added an amendment to require trainees to be assigned to their own region, and the present bill requires assignment to the center closest to the residence of such enrollee.

If there is any puddle-jumping flying still being done—I do not think there is—it is because it has turned out to be the cheapest way to get the corpsmen to the centers where they are to be trained.

With respect to taking over hotels, it is true that in the early days certain hotels which were pretty much on the ropes—I can say from my own experience that the ones I saw were rather second-class hotels—were picked up at bargain rates in order to provide trainees in the Corps with the facilities where the corpsmen could be trained in urban centers.

I saw one such hotel myself, in Albuquerque, N. Mex., where there was a Women's Job Corps camp. I can attest to the fact that the Packard-Bell Co., which is the contractor operating that Women's Job Corps center, had really made a good and shrewd purchase—it may have been a lease, I do not know: I think it was a purchase—of a facility which was extraordinarily well planned for the conduct of a Women's Job Corps camp. The fact that it happened to be a hotel seems to me to be relatively unimportant.

Of course, the initial investment in capital facilities for the Job Corps is now over, because the committee bill, in accordance with the action of Congress last year, fixes the number of enrollees at somewhere in the neighborhood of 42,000; and we do not want to see that number extended any further. The present facilities are entirely adequate to re-

ceive and continue the training of that many persons.

Let me not be too dogmatic about this. There are weaknesses in the Job Corps. There have been failures. My own view is that since Mr. Kelly took over as Director of the Job Corps, there has been an almost spectacular improvement in the caliber of its administration; and I must say, from what we see and what we have heard, including testimony from Job Corps graduates themselves, I am of the view that on balance, with some mistakes and some weaknesses, and at a cost which is high, the Job Corps program has done well and should be continued.

The Job Corps is a vital resource for the Nation. I believe it is doing as much as any other one of the poverty programs to insure that a substantial segment of disadvantaged youth shall be given the training which they require.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time. I ask how much time I have remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has consumed 25 minutes, and he therefore has 35 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. May I ask whether the 5 minutes I yielded to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on a nongermane matter have been charged to me? In other words, I wonder whether I really have 35 minutes remaining.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. He has 30 minutes remaining. He has consumed 25 minutes, and the Senator from Missouri consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor, and, with the concurrence of my friend from Nebraska, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged to neither side.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will withdraw that request, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the previous order, that the remaining time be limited to 14 minutes, to be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, and that prior thereto, we have a live quorum, with the time not to be charged to either side; in other words, that we have a live quorum, then 14 minutes of debate, and after that we vote. There will be a request for a rollcall vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not object, but before we proceed with that, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the pending amendment concerning the Job Corps, prepared by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who is necessarily absent, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB CORPS STATEMENT, OCTOBER 2, 1967

(By Senator GAYLORD NELSON)

Since the beginning of our national effort to eliminate domestic poverty, no program has been as misunderstood and as unfairly treated as the Job Corps. Adverse reaction and political attacks, reported in the press and broadcasting media, have clouded the dramatic successes achieved by this imaginative program.

As part of its review of the effectiveness of the poverty programs, the subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty this spring visited the Camp McCoy Job Corps Center at Sparta, Wisconsin. I had the honor of chairing those hearings and of visiting with camp officials and enrollees.

I was deeply impressed by the accomplishments of that center in its few short months of operation.

As with any new program of such magnitude, its development was not without problems. Initial difficulties with individual Corpsmen and with administrative procedures are being resolved.

The Center is being run by the Office of Extension of the University of Wisconsin and the Radio Corporation of America. The program and work of the Camp McCoy Center are typical of similar camps throughout the country.

From 1965 to the present time close to 100,000 young men and women have been enrolled in urban and conservation camps. These young people are the most severely disadvantaged of our society. They are school dropouts, many Armed Forces rejectees and people who have had trouble with the police.

But they are still young. Society could permit them to continue to drift and to be a burden on the taxpayer, whether on welfare or in jail, for the rest of their lives. Or we can make an effort to bring them into society, to enable them to become productive citizens and taxpayers. The Job Corps chooses the second path, and has proven itself successful. There is no question that severe difficulties have existed in forming this program. The young people we deal with have been alienated and ignored by society all their lives. Repressive disciplinary action alone cannot solve the critical problems caused by the living conditions of these enrollees.

The Job Corps is not a welfare or handout program. It trains men and women to work and to earn a decent wage.

Mayor Jerome Cavanaugh of Detroit cited before our subcommittee here in Washington the benefits derived from OEO training programs. He said, "For the most part the dollars spent through local programs are investment dollars." The Mayor cited an adult and youth employment project which cost \$788,000 and assisted 1417 persons. These people, once jobless, now earn \$4 million a year in wages and pay \$650,000 a year in taxes.

Seventy percent of those who have completed the Job Corps courses have since been placed in jobs, school or the military. Those who are working earn an average \$1.71 an hour.

Not all those who enter the centers complete their training. But few people realize that close to fifty percent of those entering college fail to complete their degree requirements. Yet this does not reflect on the quality of American universities. Nor can it be denied that the experience was of great value to those who did not graduate.

This must be kept in mind when making a judgment on the Job Corps, which begins with young people who are, in effect, dropouts from the mainstream of our society.

We have in the Job Corps a unique example of cooperation between government and private industry in an effort to show America's poor that they can be helped through our existing institutions.

This effort has just begun. My greatest regret is that the program is so limited in scope. We are reaching only a small number of those who are in need of the Job Corps.

Tragic events of the past summer should alert us to the folly of abandoning the small starts we have already made in providing a chance for America's poor and disadvantaged. Passage of the pending amendment would further erode the remaining confidence of America's poor in our commitment to help them.

Unemployment figures have taken on new and dramatic meaning in recent months. The rate in America's slums is three times the national average. Unemployment among Negro teenage boys is 31% and among girls it is 46%. Yet a recent survey revealed that 67% of unemployed slum residents are willing to take on-the-job training.

With the Job Corps a commitment was made to these young people. Today we are faced with a choice, to accept our responsibility and to continue that commitment or to attempt to turn the clock back. Reversal of the trend of these past three years is not possible. It can be undertaken only at a tremendous future cost to the United States and it cannot succeed.

Mr. CLARK. There may be other Senators who wish to put in statements also.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the New Statesman of London, September 1, 1967, had an interesting article on the Job Corps Center at Camp Kilmer, N.J., run by the Federal Electric Corp., a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp.

In these days when we hear much carping criticism about the Job Corps and indeed the whole poverty program, it is gratifying to read observations by outside observers which recognizes the value of this concept of job training. Indeed, Nora Sayre the author of "Jobs for the Dropouts," perhaps summed up in one phrase the true story of the whole Job Corps concept when she said:

The Job Corps has the simple evidence of success: thousands are now working who would probably have been on relief.

Mr. President, as we study the various aspects of the poverty program let us not lose sight of the basic fact that there are thousands upon thousands of American citizens who are ill prepared to take part in today's society. For some reason our past efforts have not reached the so-called hard-core poor. Since enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 these people have been reached. For the first time in our governmental history instead of applying palliatives to the problem of poverty, we are utilizing curative methods which, if given time and support by this body, can truly break the cycle of the poor.

I believe this article contains some interesting observations and without objection would like to have it printed in today's RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOBS FOR THE DROPOUTS

(By Nora Sayre)

From fire to fire the riots flare across the summer, while many liberals automatically deduce that the Anti-Poverty Programme is a failure or an irrelevancy. Yet, sifting the ashes and the shattered glass of riot sites, while counting the dead, should clinch the conviction that the Job Corps should be urgently expanded. Currently, there are 122 centres in the U.S. Camp Kilmer, in New Jersey—a former army base that once held Italian prisoners of war and, later, Hungarian refugees—has placed 2,039 of its 2,377 graduates in jobs. Staff members stressed that these particular young men might otherwise have been burning, smashing and dying. Aged 16 to 21, these school drop-outs are damaged goods when the arrive—but all have come voluntarily. Conspicuous for self-contempt and uncertainty, they are selected

according to need: poverty, bad family life, minimal education. Records of delinquency do not disqualify them, although "major criminal offenses" aren't acceptable, nor is retardation. At Kilmer, 70 percent are Negro and Puerto Rican. They receive \$30 a month, and average nine months' training; they can stay for a maximum of two years. On finishing they get \$50 for each month "satisfactorily completed." The Kilmer management is contracted to, the Federal Electric Corporation, a subsidiary of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation.

The Corpsmen's reading and mathematics are improved so that they can receive the equivalent of a high-school diploma, and the choice of vocational programmes includes electronics, trucking, mechanics, carpentry, painting, cooking and offset printing. (At women's centres, the courses range from secretarial training to cosmetology.) Vocational counselling is intensive; a boy who's determined on electronics but has no ability is carefully guided to a related field. Another is advised against office machine repairs if he's going to return to a hometown of 200 inhabitants without a single typewriter. It's admitted that the kitchen is an inflammatory place, and that a nervous, irascible boy shouldn't become a short-order cook subjected to yells, heat and inevitably short tempers. They are trained in on-the-job behavior, dress and hygiene, and how to act during interviews and towards an employer ("Keep to the point, he doesn't want to know about your sex-life. Watch the hep talk.") and how to budget their salaries. City drop-outs are nocturnal creatures; they tend to sleep all day and roam at night, hence many are shocked by the requirements of punctuality. The intention is to raise them to a very strong apprentice level and to provide every graduate with a letter of introduction to a specific company. Industry and corporations have responded admirably, and Job Corps centres concentrate on encouraging firm representatives to visit the camps and inspect the professional level. Thus the Job Corps has the simple evidence of success; thousands are now working who would probably have been on relief.

However, personal rehabilitation is as crucial at Kilmer as the level of future employment. Counsellors and group-leaders stimulate Corpsmen to ventilate all their problems, including racial tensions (which do exist, but have not been serious), plus the numerous manifestations of homesickness. (They come from all over the U.S. Many miss their neighborhoods or city blocks, rather than their families.) There's an emphasis throughout on expressing feelings—which must be a fresh and startling experience for many, since impoverished parents often stress silence, especially by shouting at their offspring to shut up. Today it's quite astonishing to realize that a large group can be good for its members. While armies, offices and school dormitories deaden and deflate so many psyches, it's evident that Corpsmen thrive on mutual exposure and on their eventual concern for one another. There are nightly group meetings: quite often these focus on a boy who wants to leave, while the others try very hard to persuade him to stay. They say that they feel like failures when they can't convince a classmate to remain (incidentally, anyone can leave whenever he wishes.) But the group aura is far from militant; Corpsmen say that they appreciate being allowed to work at their own different speeds, and the lack of competition. The staff is frank about intrinsic problems; one is the diversity of intelligence—mingling those who read like eight-year-olds with some who are college material. Discipline is naturally quite intense; fighting or returning drunk from a weekend results in menial tasks or fines. But, talking to Corpsmen, one learns that they are very concerned about the Corps' reputation—

and that they want each other to keep it clean. The verb 'to blow' is often heard at Kilmer; there are many references to blowing your job or your salary, as well as your cool. But repression isn't an albatross and griping is considered healthy.

Asked about their complaints (apart from the absence of girls, whom they do see on weekends or at many social events), Corpsmen were critical of the outside screeners who had glamorised the camp: 'They promise roses and cream. Hence some are disappointed. Still, the national drop-out rate is less than 19 per cent. Over a canteen lunch of fried chicken and limitless gravy, three students of heavy trucking were indignant about the costs of the space programme, and very well informed about its budget in contrast to Anti-Poverty funds: 'So go to the moon. Later. Not now. We know too many people who need what we're getting here.' However, they (and others) seemed to have little feeling about Vietnam; the army is still considered good employment, and a fair number of Corpsmen later enlist. They said that there hadn't been much 'interest' in the recent riots in New Jersey or elsewhere. One behemoth added: 'I used to be a . . . [careful pause] . . . hell-raiser. Then I got sick of standing on the corner with the wine.' They all agreed that their previous lives had been boring—'with your mother on your back all day long too.'

Since the US school system caters for the middle-class, it has already failed to serve anyone who is eligible for the Job Corps. Tangible results are important for morale at Kilmer, from the tools and machine parts which a Corpsman can keep when he's completed them, to the final diploma. A librarian remarked that there's a fierce determination to own things—that Corpsmen are pleased by the fact that everyone's given his own paperback dictionary. Noting that thousands of wooden pencils vanish from the library, he suggested that 'there must be something symbolic about owning them', and, since the camp is strewn with a host of broken pencils, he thinks that many must snap them in half during spasms of momentary frustration.

There has been ample hostility to the Job Corps, plus many tinted distortions by the press. It's true that the first applicants were not so carefully selected as they are now and that discipline has been accelerated. But the arrest rate among Corpsmen is less than half that for their age group throughout the US. Antagonism probably springs from envy of the swimming pools and other recreational amenities that nearby townsmen lack, homespun racism and the educated whites' fear of competition from Negroes with good vocational training. Also, rescuing people isn't cheap. Since it costs about \$6,950 a year to maintain one Corpsman, there's a lot of rhubarb about 'the taxpayer's dollar'—ignoring the fact that Corpsmen themselves pay taxes. Even among liberal New Yorkers there's a lax readiness to believe that Job Corps centres and festivals of delinquency. Hence visits should be compulsory for every critic. Energy and professionalism make their own testimony. At Kilmer's driving school vast trucks weave slowly between orange barrels in a serpentine obstacle-course; in an auto-service station, Corpsmen's bodies dangle or protrude from capsized cars, amidst Plotonic showers of sparks an Irish instructor lyrically extols the poetry of welding and his students' exceptional 'feel' for the medium; the dilemma of perfecting a pumpkin pie absorbs a crew of intent cooks. The Corpsmen hardly wear halos, but there are cordial and courteous, greetings to any stranger. Numerous back pockets bulge with paperback books. Seeing so many alert and intelligent faces, it's hard to remember that many were almost illiterate not long ago.

Despite its achievements, the Job Corps' budget has not been enlarged. The President is never shy of asking Congress for 'fresh

funds for Vietnam; his requests for Anti-Poverty money are punctual but less passionate. This particular Congress may be remembered for its anti-riot bill, cutbacks in aid to the poor, and a recent vote for an elegant \$10-m. Washington aquarium that few natives are said to desire.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There being no objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 271 Leg.]

Aiken	Fong	Metcalf
Bartlett	Griffin	Monroney
Boggs	Gruening	Morton
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Murphy
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Pell
Carlson	Howe	Prouty
Case	Jackson	Randolph
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Cotton	Lausche	Yarborough
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Ellender	McGee	
Fannin	McGovern	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Missouri in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allott	Hayden	Percy
Anderson	Hollings	Proxmire
Bible	Hruska	Ribicoff
Brooke	Kennedy, Mass.	Scott
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Smathers
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith
Dodd	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dominick	McCarthy	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Symington
Ervin	McIntyre	Thurmond
Fulbright	Miller	Tydings
Hansen	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Muskie	Williams, Del.
Hartke	Pearson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. Who yields time?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes. Let me say to all Senators now in the Chamber that we will vote in 14 minutes.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I should like to state what the amendment is about.

The amendment would repeal the Job Corps. It would double the money for vocational and technical training under the 1966 act.

If any Senator wishes to see how much money his State will get now and how much it would get if the full amount were authorized and appropriated; it is shown on tables 1A and 1B which are printed on pages 3 and 3A of my statement which is on the desk of each Senator.

Here is what we propose to do. By repealing the \$295 million item, we can double the money for vocational and technical training, save \$100 million annually, and reach five times as many people with training.

The cost as I have estimated it in my statement to operate a State vocational educational school, including dormitories and meals, this is far less than the Job Corps. The Job Corps is two and a half times as costly as a State or locally operated school would be with Federal funds.

When we consider that a Federal appropriation under the 1963 program must be matched, we would reach five times as many people. Here we have an opportunity to double the vocational and technical education money going to the States, eliminate one bureau, reach five times as many people, and save \$100 million annually.

The question has been raised that there is nothing in the amendment to provide for a tapering off. Yes, I am asking the Senate to vote on the general policy involved. Should the amendment carry, it will be a simple matter to implement it with additional amendments as may be necessary.

I contend that the present Job Corps method of taking a handful of people here and there, flying them across the country, then flying them home for Christmas, taking over hotels, is wasteful. It also sets a poor example.

Let us build vocational and technical schools right in the slums, right in the ghettos, so that all the people may see an example of education at its best where individuals can attend and graduate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 4 minutes of the Senator from Nebraska have expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Curtis amendment. If adopted, it will increase from \$225,000,000 to \$420 million the money available

for vocational training of the youth of our Nation. The vocational training program has been an efficient and constructive instrumentality in vesting our youth with vocations fitting them for employment.

Its cost will be far less than the cost of \$3,950 per pupil in the Job Corps.

The cost of training a dropout in the Job Corps is at least twice as much as it costs to send a youth to our institutions of higher learning in Ohio.

Dropouts are brought in for enrollment from one section of the country to another at great and unjustified cost to the taxpayers.

Enrollees are hauled from one section of the country to another for the purpose of get-togethers at home, and are then returned to their original base. Vigorous complaints of misconduct keep cropping up from around the country, misconduct of the worst kind which has taken place in some of these institutions.

My vote will make available \$195 million more for vocational training where the job can be efficiently done.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I reserve the remaining minute and a half of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I recall, Senators who were Members of this body when the Job Corps was first advanced opposed it far more vigorously than I did. I felt then that there were many problems we had to anticipate, and I regret to say that many of my fears have been realized. The proposal which is now being put forward by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is a step in the right direction, but I believe it is premature and that this is not the time to adopt it.

We must remember that we have a tremendous capital investment in Job Corps camps around the country. We must remember also that drastic changes have been made in the Job Corps program under the new Director, Mr. Kelly. Also, certain amendments which I offered and which were adopted in committee and on the floor of the Senate have, I think, strengthened the program immeasurably.

We must remember also that a number of contracts are outstanding for the operation of Job Corps camps, including those operated by big business. Many of them would be invalidated, and we would be faced immediately with a chaotic situation if the camps were closed. Furthermore, it is not possible for the vocational education personnel to take over those camps now. Perhaps in the future, they might.

Mr. President, I say regretfully to my distinguished friend from Nebraska that I cannot support his amendment now. If he offers it next year, or some similar proposal, I may have a different view of it then.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I want to read, from the report, the statement of the committee's consultant on the Job Corps:

The record of the Job Corps is clear: it tried to attract youth who had difficulty finding employment even in a tight labor market. Two of every five enrollees in May 1967 had completed 8 years of education or less. And actual educational achievement was much lower than the formal education would indicate. Reading and arithmetic comprehension for half of the enrollees was at about the fifth grade level (or below). Nearly one of every three was unable to read a simple sentence or solve a second grade arithmetic problem. Two of every five came from a broken home, and two of every five from families on relief.

The difficulty will be that these young men are going to need special training. It is not really going to do any good to try to return them to vocational schools. Studies have indicated that vocational schools are unable to deal with the peculiar and particular problems that these young men and women are facing. It is only through institutions such as the Job Corps and programs such as the Job Corps program that they are going to be able to improve their education and be enabled to later become members of the labor force and contribute to their own families and to the community.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. It is not just a question of reeducating or moving people from the unemployable level to one that will enable them to have jobs. There is an additional problem in the spectrum of employment; namely, the middle area, from which one can get from lower status employment to more technical employment which has been largely removed by virtue of automation. So it is a problem that encompasses not only those not sufficiently educated or those who are borderline, but also the whole spectrum of employment. I think it is vitally important that we continue this program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Job Corps camp at Camp Gary at San Marcos, 20 minutes away from my home, was the first established camp under this program. It trained thousands and has been one of the most efficiently operated camps in the country. It would be tragic not to continue it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

What would the Curtis amendment do?

One hundred and forty-four million dollars in facilities would be abandoned.

Eighteen million dollars in Corpsmen allotments would not be sent home.

Over \$23 million in conservation work would go undone.

Eighty thousand deprived youth would not be served.

An economic impact on 123 communities in 38 States where the centers are operating would be felt.

Over \$125 million of contracts with private industry would be terminated.

We would substitute a middle class program and a vocational education program for a program to help the poor people of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 1 minute and a half remaining.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, has all time been used except the 1½ minutes remaining to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Nebraska except 1 minute and a half has been used.

Mr. CURTIS. Has all time except the 1 minute and a half remaining to me been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree that the Senator should have the concluding argument, so I yield back my time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, let me again state we are voting on a policy question. Are we going to bring the States and localities into the program, to save money, and to bring the schools where the poor people are? If this proposal carries, there can easily be a detailed amendment on the tapering off. No one has risen to defend the Job Corps during this debate. The charge that they have been flying around, taking over hotels, is true. One of the first things that occurred at the hotel in Omaha was that they removed the Gideon Bibles.

Government can provide the schools, but flying people around or a law cannot meet the character question that causes people who want to learn to do something and be self-supporting. The only way to encourage people to do that is to establish a good school in the poor areas, and not by getting people to go away from home and nobody knowing what happens to them after they leave. I daresay very few return to improve their own surroundings. There is something about a partnership between individuals and the State and local governments that brings to people those things that make such training a success.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. The bureaucracy is making the fight of its life to stay in office. I ask for the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HOLLINGS (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LAUSCHE (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]. If he were present and vot-

ing, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is necessarily absent and his pair has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. If present and voting, the Senator Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 272 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Allott	Ervin	Morton
Boggs	Fannin	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Murphy
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Percy
Cooper	Holland	Sparkman
Cotton	Hruska	Spong
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	Miller	Williams, Del.

NAYS—49

Aiken	Fulbright	Mansfield
Anderson	Griffin	McCarthy
Bartlett	Gruening	McGee
Bible	Hart	McGovern
Brooke	Hartke	McIntyre
Burdick	Hayden	Metcalf
Cannon	Inouye	Mondale
Carlson	Jackson	Monroney
Case	Kennedy, Mass.	Pearson
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pell
Clark	Kuchel	Prouty
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Fong	Magnuson	Randolph

Ribicoff	Symington	Young, N. Dak.
Scott	Tydings	Young, Ohio
Smathers	Williams, N.J.	
Smith	Yarborough	

NOT VOTING—21

Baker	Hatfield	Morse
Bayh	Hickenlooper	Moss
Bennett	Hollings	Muskie
Brewster	Javits	Nelson
Dirksen	Lausche	Pastore
Gore	Long, La.	Russell
Harris	Montoya	Tower

So Mr. CURTIS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE VIETNAM CONFLICT AND
WASHINGTON

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for the past 2 weeks I have been in Southeast Asia, by leave of the Senate. This ancient land has, for a long time, been the scene of recurrent strife among the many peoples who have come there over the centuries. In the past generation, that strife has largely degenerated into fratricide, terror, and bloody war, in which the forces of fading colonialism, expanding Asiatic communism, and national independence have been contending. For almost all of my 15 years in the Senate, our own country has become increasingly involved. And from the very beginning, that involvement has produced some contrary views.

In the past few weeks, the American press, and—I can personally testify—the press in Asia, have reported an intensification of the debate here at home. Free and constructive debate, of course, is vital. The American people need to know the truth, and Members of the Senate have a duty to seek it out.

Last May, I said in the Senate:

The larger Communist powers must be on notice of the determination of the government and people of the United States to bring an end to our effort by negotiation, if possible, but by military force, if necessary.

Those remain my views now.

I cannot say that a fortnight abroad qualifies me as an expert. The fact is that, as with all human problems, there are currents and crosscurrents, good and bad, some full of hope, some full of despair. There are no clear-cut, guaranteed answers; and no catch phrase, however artful, can help guide us in this time of crisis. The views I express are my own, and represent my best judgment of the general situation.

Mr. President, as I see it, the American people face two basic issues in this trag-

edy. One is Communist aggression against South Vietnam and, less visibly, against Laos and Thailand. The other is more directly in the sphere of the Senate and the Congress, as a matter of national policy. It is the question of the continuing commitment of the United States and its overwhelming might to collective security of free peoples in Asia.

In Vietnam our leaders, both civilian and military, believe they see a dim light at the edge of a distant horizon. There are visible signs of progress in allied military operations, and in political development, as well. Even America's severest critics recognize that our Armed Forces have destroyed Communist hopes for military conquest of the south.

Land communications among cities in Vietnam have been expanded and secured. Villages, long out of touch with major cities, have resumed nearly normal contact. In Pleiku, I spoke with Montagnard tribesmen, some of whom had not in decades had any relationship with the central government in Saigon. They are now learning that they are part of a large nation. Many of them are fighting for their homeland. In the Mekong Delta, waterways between the tributaries of that great river have been made secure for the passage of trade. Sampan operators have been quick to exploit this situation and, incidentally, to express their gratitude for protection against Vietcong extortion and terror. These roads and waterways continue to require vigilant patrol which they are receiving. But the access they give is vital to the health and progress of South Vietnam.

The allied military effort is now supported by a vast complex of port and airfield facilities. Our forces are no longer dependent solely upon the congested harbor at Saigon. Our air forces have been deployed widely over the entire countryside. They are able to respond rapidly to any call for air support. In military terms, the essential logistic elements are in place. The capital investment in our military effort has been made.

While our communications have become more secure, the Communist enemy has been pushed out of most of his base areas. Under continued pressure from the air, land, and sea, his units are forced to keep moving. Enemy casualties have been high, possibly higher than the Communists can replace at present rates of recruitment and infiltration.

In the northern provinces the war on the Communist side has passed largely into the hands of regular units of the North Vietnamese Army—so severely have the Viet Cong been decimated. In these areas, the initiative remains largely with our forces. As one officer said to me, "When you have difficulty getting a fight, you know the enemy has problems." The enemy seems to have many problems. Only when he can operate out of sanctuaries, such as the demilitarized zone along the border north of Con Thien, does he seek to engage our forces on a large scale.

I do not pretend to pass judgment on military developments, except to note these points which were confirmed by a number of sources, both civilian and military, both American and South Viet-

namese. It is clear that a base for progress has been laid. The tide of battle has long since stopped running in favor of the Communist Vietnamese. This is an enormous tribute to the thousands of American youth in uniform now serving in Vietnam. I spoke freely with them at every opportunity, from aboard the aircraft carrier *Coral Sea* in the Tonkin Gulf to a bivouac at Jackson Hole on the Cambodian border. Their morale is high. They have no fear. They believe in their mission. One-half million gallant Americans are participating in the defense of South Vietnam and the greater effort of knitting together the fabric of her nationhood. America is particularly fortunate to have the services in this struggle of Gen. William Westmoreland. His grip on the complexities of this unprecedented conflict has marked him as an outstanding military leader in our time. Without attempting to name them, our military personnel, from Admiral U.S. Grant Sharp to each of our enlisted men, and our civil servants, from Ambassador Bunker, and the other excellent ambassadors representing this country in that area, to our young advisers in the hamlets and in the villages, represent the finest kind of our fellow Americans.

The Communists now know that they cannot win on the battlefield. Their hopes lie in diplomacy and political action designed to divide and conquer the Vietnamese people. Here, our counter has been a determined effort to improve the life of the village people of South Vietnam and to free them from the yoke of Vietcong intimidation, extortion, and terror.

This program is making slow but steady progress. In Quang Tri Province, only a few miles south of the battle at Con Thien, I was able to see the work of a revolutionary development cadre in bringing renewed hope to a small village by building a new school, providing medical facilities and instruction, and by organizing self-government. I saw a similar process in the Mekong Delta, a village which only two weeks earlier had been under Vietcong domination and control.

Vietnamese villagers seem to respond readily to the offer of new life. Wherever security can be provided, the possibility for political stability is apparent. But, after decades of struggle, villagers are not always convinced that the central government's forces will remain. Some fear the day when the Vietcong may return. In the pacification effort, security is vital, and it must be sure.

Pacification is a crucial part of the struggle. The late President Kennedy called it "another type of war, new in its intensity, ancient in its origin—war by guerrillas, subversives, insurgents, assassins, war by ambush, instead of by combat; by infiltration instead of aggression, seeking victory by eroding and exhausting the enemy instead of engaging him."

This kind of war requires an intimate understanding of local conditions. It must, therefore, primarily be the mission of the Vietnamese Armed Forces and the Vietnamese people.

The Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam have taken large casualties in its national cause—over 100,000 killed

last year, over 49,000 killed since 1961. Allied troops fight by their side against North Vietnamese regulars in the provinces north of Saigon. In the populous delta in the south, they have the primary role. Their determination to continue to fight the war by ambush is essential to me, to the success of the pacification effort and to the eventual freedom and independence of South Vietnam. They have undertaken this role, different from that assigned to the U.S. forces, by general agreement among military and civilian leaders in Vietnam. American commanders see clearly the need for this division of responsibility. They recognize that they can far better discharge the role of separating the Vietcong from the people as a whole. This is a military judgment and a military decision, and it makes sense to me. Without this work, the Communist Vietcong will continue to hold in thrall many areas of South Vietnam, particularly in the rice-rich delta region, where 40 percent of the South Vietnamese population resides.

South Vietnam is now at a critical juncture. The constitutional process is moving forward. The armed forces are ceding their authority to representatives of the people. Their willingness to prosecute the war will be increasingly susceptible to political pressures, both from within South Vietnam and from the world outside, particularly from the United States. God knows their score is not perfect. I visited a delta hamlet where a supposedly crack South Vietnamese unit did not, perhaps was not willing to, assume the initiative to protect the villagers.

I spoke at length with President-elect Thieu about the work of the army in the pacification program. He is dedicated to civilian rule and civilian control over the armed forces. He also recognizes the vital role of the armed forces in the pacification program. I believe he sees, as do our military and civilian leaders, that the gains of the past few months will be meaningless unless that program goes forward. Any untoward political development, any unreal psychological victory for the north, or a tragic reversal in the progress already made in the constitutional process could severely weaken the determination of the South Vietnamese Army to take on this important job.

This delicate situation must not be affected by any failure of understanding on our part. Collective security inevitably involves commitment. There can be no effective alliance without mutual and reinforcing support. The question of unilateral cessation of bombing and our nation commitment in Southeast Asia must be seen in this perspective.

Mr. President, while in Southeast Asia, I read statements by a number of my colleagues calling for a unilateral halt to the bombardment of North Vietnam by air as a means of opening peace negotiations. I also listened yesterday to some of my colleagues for whom I have the highest respect, as they spoke on this subject. So far as I know, the objective of these negotiations has not been specified beyond an expressed desire for peace.

The point I wish to try to make, Mr. President, is that a unilateral halt in bombing would be of great value to the North Vietnamese. Five times in the past we have undertaken a cessation of hostilities in the hope of reaching the conference table. Each time the north has used this pause as a means of stepping up infiltration into the south and of resupplying its forces. Following the stand down for the Tet holiday in February, the Communists were able rapidly to expand their operations as a result of the respite from our attacks on their lines of supply. Many American lives were lost in later months because our open-handed action failed.

A tabulation of what the marines of the I Corps area euphemistically call "incoming" shows how important these resupply operations were to the enemy. "Incoming" is the name applied to inbound artillery, mortar, and rocket shells fired against South Vietnamese and American positions. As the American press has been vividly reporting in the last few weeks, this bombardment, largely from the sanctuary of the so-called Demilitarized Zone, north of the Ben Hai River, has accounted for a high percentage of our casualties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks that a tabulation of incoming mortar, artillery, and rocket shells fired on American position in the I Corps area since July 1966 be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, the tabulation will be printed in the RECORD.

The tabulation is as follows:

INCOMING MORTAR, ARTILLERY AND ROCKET SHELLS

	Mortar	Artillery	Rocket
1966—July.....	1,135	-----	-----
August.....	647	-----	-----
September.....	859	-----	-----
October.....	510	-----	-----
November.....	498	-----	-----
December.....	1,425	-----	-----
1967—January.....	690	-----	-----
February.....	1,177	-----	51
March.....	6,268	150	219
April.....	3,848	850	40
May.....	5,140	1,346	398
June.....	1,906	1,950	153
July.....	3,641	3,134	190
August.....	3,095	2,406	75
Total.....	30,839	9,836	1,081

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to refer to the tabulation, which is a tabulation prepared by fellow American citizens wearing the uniform of the U.S. Marine Corps, covering the period from July 1966, to August 1967. It demonstrates incoming mortar, artillery, and rockets from the demilitarized zone and from the southernmost portion of North Vietnam against our position and the position occupied by the Army of the Republic of South Vietnam in the First Corps area.

Mr. President, let those figures speak for themselves. It seems to me that they are convincing proof that during the unilateral bombing pause by the allies, the North Vietnamese were feverishly building up their positions in order to strike with greater force against our allies and our own American military personnel.

The tabulation shows at least a five-

fold jump in mortar fire after the Tet stand-down. It shows the first appearance of artillery and rocket fire immediately after the pause. There can be no doubt that this stepped-up action resulted from improved supply to the enemy's forces.

There are those who argue that the Communist North requires only a "face-saving gesture" in order to accept reasonable terms at the conference table. But the logic is far more persuasive than North Vietnam hopes to gain both military and political advantage by cynically exploiting the worldwide yearning for peace. Is there any one in this Chamber who is willing to contend that North Vietnam is not the aggressor?

The American bastions at Con Thien and Gio Linh, south of the demilitarized zone, have been taking hundreds of incoming shells fired from the DMZ and from North Vietnamese territory. A principal defense of those bastions has been aerial bombardment. At this stage, the loss of these allied positions would be a tremendous psychological victory for the north. A unilateral bombing halt would deny the Marine garrison at Con Thien now a vital air cover, and leave it open to massive ground assault.

On September 22, I saw Con Thien and Gio Linh. I talked with the men of the 3d Marine Division at Dong Ha. In the course of that trip, I observed a B-52 raid on entrenched artillery positions of the enemy in the demilitarized zone. The men of the 3d Marines live with a daily rain of incoming shells. I cannot understand how any fairminded approach to honorable negotiations would deny them their principal means of defense through air power while they are under attack. Nor do I believe that we can ever be expected to declare a unilateral stand-down that would permit the North Vietnamese unilaterally to improve their positions in this now critical area—the only place in Vietnam where regular Army units of the Communist north have been on the offensive in recent months.

Mr. President, Americans believe in peace. That is why we joined the United Nations. Americans abhor aggression in any form. That is why collective security has been basic to our foreign policy. Our presence in South Vietnam is earnest testimony of our adherence to those deeply held views. In our zealous quest for a speedy end to all hostilities there, we must not be blind to the indispensable necessity that the peace we seek to achieve must be both just and enduring. In May, I said in the Senate:

Whether we like it or not, the United States is committed today in Viet Nam. The issue before us now is not the origin of our involvement in the conflict but bringing it to a conclusion, honorably, and, hopefully, peacefully.

I like what J. R. Wiggins, the distinguished editor of the Washington Post, wrote a short time ago:

The scale of the Viet Nam war already has demonstrated that the price tag on such wars of national liberation is higher and the risk greater than the hawks of North Viet Nam must have anticipated. If there occurs in Viet Nam a demonstration that such wars involve an unendurable risk and an unbearable cost

My able friend from Indiana has said nobody is fighting in the North. Precisely. The fighting is in the South. As I asked in my comments, does any Senator deny that the North is the aggressor? I think the answer is "No." Nobody denies it.

Mr. HARTKE. I say to my friend from California that that is exactly why I was driving at the point so hard. It is well known that the invasion plans for invading the North have been drawn up for a long time. Whether they will be implemented is another question; but everyone knows those invasion plans are ready.

I ask my friend from California, is that what he was advocating? Is he advocating, as the military clique of this country has been advocating, that North Vietnam be invaded? Is he advocating, that by these little hints and innuendos, such as we have heard before every step of this escalation as it has gone forward? First comes the hint. Now we have the statement of the former Ambassador to South Vietnam, Mr. Lodge, speaking in Pittsburgh, seemingly sending up another trial balloon. Is that what the Senator from California is telling the Senate, that now we must be prepared to take on the aggressor in the north, in his own territory?

While 15 million people, with the help of the most powerful nation on earth, cannot defend themselves on their own territory is the Senator saying, by inference, that we should invade the north?

Mr. KUCHEL. I shall not ask the reporter to read back all that I have said during the last 2 hours, but I do ask the Senator from Indiana to take a look at the RECORD tomorrow, and examine the words and phrases I have used, based upon which he can answer that question for himself. Meanwhile, I shall merely state that the answer is "No."

Mr. HARTKE. As I read the statement of the Senator from California, he says that as far as they are concerned, if they cannot achieve victory, "America must not sully her commitment to the security of free Asia by groping for a nameless settlement." The Senator says we must hold for a military victory until we have attained it.

I have repeatedly asked the Senator why those 16 million people of North Vietnam are able to keep the 15 million people of the South on the defensive, when they have 500,000 Americans over there fighting and dying. Why are they not able to protect themselves? I leave that question with the Senate.

Mr. President, I think this is a serious question. I think this is why so many Senators are concerned today. We seem to be hearing hints that there is about to be another turn of the escalation screw, such as we have heard before every one of these turns. Again we hear it said, "We are into it now, and we cannot withdraw."

All I can say is, I hope we never take that next turn of the screw, that we do not move again up that escalation ladder, from which there seems to be no return. The bombing of the north, the Tonkin Gulf resolution—each one of those things was a gradual step which

followed little hints, little side statements, little inferences, with denial after denial that the situation in which we find ourselves would be the result.

I say to the Senator from California, before we invade North Vietnam, before that course is taken, the administration ought to think twice, three times, four times, or as many times as necessary, before it takes us down the road to utter ruin.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I most sincerely suggest that my able friend block out a couple of weeks and visit Southeast Asia, and take a look for himself.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

THE COPPER STRIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are approaching the 80-day mark in the major work stoppage in the copper mining industry. It has been apparent for some time that there is evidently no real desire, or at least no effort on the part of the unions or the management involved to get together to bargain in good faith and to reach an agreement which might bring this situation to an end. In this respect both labor and management are at fault because up to this time both of them are not even paying lip service to the free collective bargaining process.

Both labor and management ought to, even at this late date, get down to hard discussions about ways and means by which this strike could be settled. At the instigation of various Members of the Senate from copper-producing States, Secretaries Wirtz and Trowbridge did call to Washington representatives of unions and companies during the first part of September. There was no progress reached toward a settlement at that time, and following this meeting both Secretary Trowbridge and Secretary Wirtz stated that the situation was hopeless.

I do not agree. I think we ought to give consideration to the miner and the smelterman who is out on strike, because his purchasing power is being diminished. The many needs to look after his family and his obligations are not now being met. Many of these people are seeking part time or other forms of labor in other fields. Many members of the craft unions in Butte, Anaconda, Great Falls, and elsewhere are moving to other parts of the Nation to find employment, and many of them will not return to Montana. The States effected are losing revenue at an alarming rate.

I am today requesting the President to appoint a study committee to assess the effects of the strike on the national defense effort. I am also requesting him to look into all the available means at his disposal to bring this matter to a head.

I am hopeful that he and his advisers can come up with the means to cope with this long-drawn-out strike to which there is no end in sight. But, in all candor, the only authority I know of that the President has is the invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Frankly, I do not think that Taft-Hartley is the answer, because it would cover only a period of 80 days, and then if no settlement were reached the strike might well begin again in the middle of the winter when conditions would be worse for the miner and the smelterman and their families. I am not at all certain that legislation similar to that which now covers the railroad shop crafts difficulty would be the answer either. I do believe, however, that if collective bargaining in good faith is not undertaken in the immediate future by the companies and the unions that other ways and means will have to be considered in the interest of the economies of the States affected by the strike as well as the Nation as a whole.

May I say that I deplore the trend toward Government intervention in these matters—a trend encouraged by both labor and management—because it degrades the principle of free collective bargaining and it places in the hands of the central government powers it should not have and does not want.

I, therefore, request the unions and the companies involved to meet on this matter, and I would hope that consideration would be given to the possibility in Montana as it has already been given in Utah, of the Anaconda Co. and leaders of the respective unions getting together to discuss the matter as it affects my State.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, very few legislative items which reach the floor of the Senate raise such high emotion and feeling, year after year, as does the poverty bill.

And with good reason. The programs in the poverty bill are different in concept and in execution from ordinary Federal programs—and they are different because they are aimed at no ordinary problem. They are aimed at the problem of loosing the bonds of poverty.

For some people, these differences mark a bold and needed departure from traditional notions of Federal assistance programs. For other people, however, the differences pose a threat—the threat of the unfamiliar.

I find it strange that those who criticize the Government for not doing anything, or of not doing enough, for the poor, are very often the same ones who

cry out that the poverty program should be rendered asunder, and that its component programs be transferred to old-line agencies—those same agencies criticized, out of another side of the mouth, for doing nothing.

I am one who sees the poverty program as a bold and needed departure. Innovation should not be restricted to private enterprise—whenever a severe challenge is being faced, then Government, too, should not rely upon old established patterns, but should construct a new organization reflecting modern ideas and techniques. Only then can we be sure that our response to a complex problem will be sophisticated and effective.

That, I submit, is what OEO is doing. Those who took part in the creation of OEO in 1963 and 1964—within and without the Government and in both the legislative and executive branches—seized upon the single most important concept for breaking the bonds of poverty—the concept of opportunity. OEO was to be a way station for those Americans trapped by their heritage in the hopelessness of poverty. OEO was—and is—only designed to get these individuals to the bottom rung of the ladder, at which point the standard institutional structure of schools, jobs, and health services will take over.

For some 35 million poor Americans, hard as it is to believe, the pathways to advancement simply are not open. For these 35 million poor people, opportunity is something other people have, and which the poor cannot get.

The poor do not have the opportunity to get other than menial jobs, because they dropped out of school and cannot meet the educational requirements. The advertisements for jobs which fill the classified pages of our newspapers are, for the poor, cruel reminders of what other people can have.

The poor cannot keep up with their first-grade classmates, because no one has ever read to them, they have never seen a doctor or dentist, and have lived on bad food. Forty percent of poor children, for example, have identified a picture of a teddy bear as a picture of a rat—for they are more familiar with the rodent than with the toy;

The poor cannot hold jobs, because they are sicker more often and when sick, are sicker longer because they cannot afford medical treatment. Influenza, tuberculosis, dysentery—these are illnesses poor Americans live with;

The elderly poor often live out of their years in loneliness and frustration, not knowing what is available for them in benefits and services. The unheated interiors of dark rooms are the last horizons of far too many of our elderly poor;

The poor never know what jobs are open, and that job training is often available as an assist in getting the jobs. The poor are simply outside the stream of communication and information most Americans take as universal.

OEO's programs are an attempt to change all this—an attempt to open up broad new avenues of opportunity to advancement.

The remarkable successes of this bold attempt are a matter of record. This record is, unfortunately, obscured all too often by wild charges and accusations—but it nevertheless is there.

I want to cite just a few examples of this impressive record, compiled in just two and a half years.

JOB CORPS

More than 70,000 young men and women have been enrolled in the Job Corps since its inception, in either the 83 conservation centers or the 26 urban centers. Of the total enrollees, including those who did not complete the course, fully 70 percent are placed in jobs, schools, or the military. This is an astonishingly high figure, when one takes into account that the Job Corps works on the hardcore, poor unemployed youth of America. In carrying out the tough task it has set for itself, the Job Corps has made extensive use of private industry. Of the 26 urban centers, for example, all but four are actually operated by some of America's largest industries, such as IBM, Ford, Xerox, and Litton Industries. In the instance of the Job Corps, OEO is a catalyst—it has provided a mechanism for our unemployed youth to reach the bottom rung of the ladder of advancement, and in doing so has opened the doors of employment in some of our most modern industries.

HEADSTART

In 1967, Headstart will involve nearly 700,000 four- and five-year-old children. For these children, Headstart means a medical examination, it means a hot meal a day, and, most important, it means educational preparation for entering the regular school system. Most children of poor families begin school with two strikes against them; Headstart is an attempt to eliminate this penalty.

NEIGHBORHOOD HEALTH CENTERS

By the end of fiscal year 1967, OEO had funded 35 neighborhood health centers, bringing to those neighborhoods in which the centers operate a revolution in health care.

The poor simply do not get even the rudimentary health care most Americans take for granted. Fifty percent of poor children, for example, do not receive adequate smallpox and measles immunizations. Sixty-four percent of poor children have never seen a dentist. Forty-four percent of all women who have babies in public hospitals have no prenatal care. For poor people, the chance of dying before reaching age 35 is four times higher than for better-off Americans.

It was knowledge of this situation which led me last year to propose the amendment to the OEO bill which authorized the neighborhood health center program within the framework of the community action program. I have been gratified by the response my amendment has generated, because I have seen what the centers have been able to do for poor Americans.

Let me cite a few examples.

In families with incomes under \$4,000,

less than 60 percent sought out a doctor even once during the last year. But in Denver, where a neighborhood health center is operating, 85 percent of the people in the target area saw a doctor, and in Boston, where a center is located in the Columbia Point public housing project, 92 percent of the people saw a doctor last year. These same results carry through to more specific aspects of health care. Ninety-seven percent of low-income mothers in Columbia Point, and 85–95 percent in Denver, now receive prenatal care—contrasted with the only 44 percent of poor mothers nationwide. Less than 11 percent of poor children under 15 years old, nationwide, saw a pediatrician last year. But in Boston and Denver, as a result of the neighborhood health center, 95 percent and 85–95 percent, respectively, saw a pediatrician.

There is one other noteworthy aspect of the impact of neighborhood health centers. Poor people, with no access to family physicians, use the emergency rooms as a family clinic, which, as many hospital administrators have testified, is a disruption to the ordinary hospital services. The dramatic impact on this use of the emergency rooms in New York City, in the vicinity of the Gouverneur Health Center, is illustrated by a series of statistics: in 1961, emergency room visits totaled 26,000; in 1962, 30,000; in 1963, 31,000; and in 1964, 32,000. Then in 1966, when the health center began operation, the emergency room visits began dropping, and in the first full year of operation, 1966, was down to 26,000. This indicates to me that the neighborhood health centers, while bringing a new order of life to the poor, have the side effect of improving the operation of our hospitals.

The guidelines and regulations for the neighborhood health center program were available only in mid-February of this year, which means that they have been circulated for only 6 months. Yet more than 100 formal applications for neighborhood health centers have been received in OEO's office. Unfortunately, OEO has programmed only \$15 to \$20 million for the inception of 10 to 15 new centers in fiscal year 1968, the remainder of the \$60 million being used for refunding of existing centers. While we all know the pressures of the Federal budget, we will surely have difficulty justifying to the doctors and mayors—who want to get health centers why they must be turned down—and justifying to the poor why they must continue to be denied the rudiments of medical care.

It has also been gratifying to see the support and involvement of the medical profession. Dr. Harold Margulies, assistant director of the AMA's Division of Socioeconomic Activities, said this about the health centers:

I think it is eminently correct that this be part of the OEO program. . . . This is something which the AMA looks to with great warmth, to which the AMA is pledging full cooperation, and for which we think there is a very good future.

Last year's AMA president, Dr. Charles Hudson, also supported the health centers, and these two doctors stand out in

contrast to this year's president, Dr. Milford Rouse. It is Dr. Rouse who made the incredible statement that health care is not a right, but is a privilege for those who can afford it. I think we can all be sure that Dr. Rouse did not speak for a majority of American doctors when he said that.

For example, in California, the medical and dental societies actually operate two health centers; in Chicago, three health centers are being operated by community hospitals, whose policies are determined by the local board of health and the doctors who comprise the staffs. And there are many other examples of the close involvement of the medical profession with this program.

Further, OEO, the Surgeon General, and the Public Health Service work jointly on the program, and it has the enthusiastic support of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In short, the neighborhood health center program has, like Headstart, filled a void in opportunities available to the poor. This month OEO announced that a health center would begin operation in Watts, to serve 30,000 people out of the 350,000—half the population of San Francisco—who live in Watts. The Neighborhood Health Council has indicated that it wants to begin with other health centers very soon, because people from other areas of Watts want the same opportunity to have their illnesses treated. The need is vast—but the available funds are few. This is in no small way one of the reasons for the unfulfilled expectations of so many of the people living in poverty, in our urban ghettos and in our rural areas.

There are many other aspects of the poverty program which have made important inroads into the lack of opportunities open to poor Americans. The migrant worker programs, the work experience programs, the legal services programs, VISTA—all these and more have brought the new light of hope to dim lives.

The Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee, chaired by the distinguished and hard-working senior Senator from Pennsylvania, has undertaken an extensive and comprehensive examination of all phases of the poverty program. Senator CLARK's presentations to the Senate have detailed the scope of this examination, and I will not repeat it except for his conclusion: That the examination has shown the need to continue OEO in existence, while working some changes in the statute. That is what the bill before us does: Works the changes the examination has shown need to be made, while continuing the poverty program in existence for another 2 years.

It was my privilege to chair 2 days of hearings in Massachusetts, as part of the nationwide examination being carried out by the Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee. In those 2 days, we heard from witnesses in Boston, Springfield, and New Bedford, as well as inspecting the Rodman Job Corps Camp outside New Bedford. To be sure, we heard criticism of the poverty program during the nearly 15 hours of testi-

mony—but the criticism was directed not at the concepts governing the design of the component programs. Neither was it directed at the operation of OEO. What it was directed at, in general, was the disparity between the tremendous needs of the poor and the funds available to operate OEO programs. This can hardly be called a criticism of the poverty program, as we have it before us in this Chamber.

But there are areas in which legislative changes are needed, areas in which the committee has acted on the basis of its thorough examination.

There are three basic areas of change I want to discuss briefly, as most others have been thoroughly covered either by the distinguished floor manager of the bill, or else by other Senators.

These three areas are health of the poor, the elderly poor, and neighborhood organizations.

HEALTH OF THE POOR

The existing legislation authorizing neighborhood health centers has, as I have pointed out, generated an overwhelming and enthusiastic response from communities across the country. I think it unfortunate that this demand cannot be satisfied, but we have at least made a beginning.

I have already cited many of the deficiencies in health services available to the poor, the deficiencies which neighborhood health centers are designed to overcome. But there is another and critical deficiency in health services for the poor—the availability of health personnel skilled in the special needs of the poor. To overcome this deficiency, I introduced an amendment to the bill in committee, which now appears as section 221(b)(3)(B).

This amendment authorizes the provision of financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations, and to individuals, for programs and projects designed to develop knowledge and to enhance skills in the provision of health services for the poor.

There is an acute shortage of doctors and other qualified health professionals trained for and concerned about the provision of health services to the poor. Experience with the promising development of neighborhood health centers, located in areas populated largely by poor people, has revealed a need for more qualified personnel. The basic purpose of the amendment is to induce a many-sided effort to help overcome this shortage.

The testimony given to the subcommittee, during this examination of the poverty program and the needs it is designed to fill, confirm the need for this specialized training. For example, Dr. Joel Alpert, medical director of the Family Health Care program at the Harvard Medical School, said this to our subcommittee:

I do not believe that we presently possess the necessary body of knowledge that enables us to deliver care in the community. I hope that the patient care field would have the same characteristic development of fellowship programs as has characterized [other health specialties]. Fellowship training provides the physician with the opportu-

nity, beyond residency, or in place of residency, to acquire the needed skills. . . . I say this because at the moment, members of various programs being developed under the Poverty Program require staffing by physicians who are not presently available, let alone specially trained or appropriately trained to provide this care. I plead for the development of fellowship programs which would not only enable physicians to acquire these necessary skills, but would serve as a focus to attract physicians to the provision of patient care as an exciting and appropriate career.

This testimony I found compelling, persuasive, and, when joined with other material, amply sufficient to justify the Amendment I offered.

The problem of providing health services for the poor involves four related issues: First, developing institutional arrangements and services which would be more responsive to the needs of the poor; second, training personnel equipped to help develop programs for reaching the poor with health services; third, training health personnel to serve in such programs; and fourth, developing educational facilities to provide such personnel with specialized training.

The connection between poor health and poverty is now beginning to receive the active attention it has long warranted. The relationship between poverty and lack of education is acknowledged, and is being acted on in various ways. It is my belief that the provision of health services to the poor requires special, new approaches, just as education for the poor does. Education and good health are utterly fundamental to all change of social and economic status. This is true of the less-developed countries of the world, and it is true of the less-developed areas of our own country. Without this fundamental equipment, there is no opportunity for the poor to gain full membership in our society.

The overall objective of the amendment, therefore, is twofold: First, to encourage the entry of larger numbers of people into the health science professions from among the most deprived sections of the population; and second, to help in their training by improving and expanding existing training facilities, with special emphasis on preparation for the provision of health services to the poor.

In order to recruit students for the health science professions, a series of intensive educational measures must be taken. With rare exceptions, the poor cannot now qualify adequately for professional schools because family background and previous educational experience do not prepare them for the demands of the school work, or for sustaining the necessary motivation.

While medicine, dentistry and nursing have been classic fields for social mobility in this country, this situation is changing, especially among the Negro population. Negro students can now choose among many vocations offering quick changes in economic and social status, as compared with the longer training required for such professions as medicine and even dentistry. Although the number of Negro physicians increased by 37.6 percent between 1950 and 1960, the rep-

resentation of Negroes in the medical profession actually fell in comparison with their representation in other professions. In 1950, Negro physicians constituted 2.0 percent of all Negroes in the professions; by 1960, this figure had fallen to 1.7 percent.

Any program to increase the number of health professionals drawn from the ranks of the poor, Negro and white alike, must deal with the problems in depth and will probably require a commitment to upgrading educational opportunities offered Negro and other deprived students at all levels, especially at the high school and college levels. This amendment authorizes a beginning of such efforts for poor students intending to enter the health professions.

Such a program requires financial support both for institutions and individuals. It should be a flexible, pioneering program, putting emphasis on these four factors; training people to participate in organizing new and more effective means of delivery of medical services for the poor; recruiting and training health personnel for such services; assisting institutions in which personnel can be trained to enter and to work in the field in a variety of capacities and at variety of levels; providing a stimulus to advanced training, and to research in all aspects of the problem.

The amendment would authorize OEO to take the following steps:

First. To provide by grant, contract, or otherwise for educational exchanges, and for studies, research, and instruction and for other educational activities intended to develop knowledge or skills in the field of health services for the poor. Provision could be made to support research and development in methods of delivering health services to the poor; to assist in the establishment, expansion, and maintenance of educational and training courses concerned with community health care, with special emphasis on health care for the poor; and to foster studies through professorships, lectureships, institutes, conferences, seminars, and courses in such subjects as are necessary to encourage concern with and improve knowledge of the health and other disciplines associated with the provision and delivery of health care for the poor;

Second. To initiate a series of stipends or fellowships designed to encourage and support both prospective and senior health professionals in obtaining education, experience and training in the area of the health sciences. A first concern would be with regard to students who would prepare to enter the stream of education leading into health professions. For professionals, the primary concern would be to provide practical experience specifically in the innovative forms of delivery of health services to the poor, which would be augmented by academic studies in a professional school affiliated with such services or in one which offers courses relevant to the field experience undertaken;

Third. Funds available for programs under this amendment would be available for orientation courses or other appropriate services and materials for poor

persons intent upon entering fields related to the purposes of this amendment, whether or not they are receiving other financial support from the Government; and to provide or continue services to increase the effectiveness of the programs following the completion of the fellowship term;

Fourth. For the purpose of assisting recipients of stipends to make the best possible use of their opportunities and assisting them in directing their talents and initiative into channels which will make them more effective leaders, teachers, advisers, and workers in the field of health care for the poor, suitable arrangements may be made for the establishment of an adequate counseling service at training centers and appropriate colleges and universities;

Fifth. The stipends or fellowships could be financed, administered, and awarded by OEO with private organizations, notably foundations and academic institutions. Private organizations, firms, licensing boards, professional associations, agencies, international organizations, foundations, academic institutions, and private individuals should be encouraged to participate to the maximum extent feasible in carrying out this amendment, and to make contributions of funds, property, and services which would be acceptable to be utilized to carry out the purposes of this amendment. And, of course, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is directed to work closely with OEO in the administration of the amendment;

Sixth. Stipends would be of several varieties related to the educational and experimental status of the candidate. I would contemplate that the varieties would include: First, one category of stipend for students undertaking education in disciplines leading to professional training in the health science professions. The second category for students in professional schools who would be preparing for service in the health professions. I hope that recipients of these stipends would spend a period of weeks, or months, up to 1 year—with the approval of professional schools—in a community health service. The third category would be for students who have just completed their medical or other graduate health professional training; the stipend would be for 1 year of service in a community health facility augmented by academic work in a recognized medical professional school. A fourth category would provide fellowships for graduate physicians or other health professionals at the point in training where resident specialties are undertaken, and in this instance the training would be equivalent to specialization in community health work, would be for longer than 1 year, and would include tours of duty in neighborhood health facilities in both urban and rural settings, in Job Corps camps and in VISTA centers. A fifth category would be for physicians or others with experience in private practice who would undertake 1 year's work in community service augmented by academic work. A sixth category would be for members of medical or other health related disciplines who would do research in, or widen their experience of,

or give technical assistance to, community health facilities.

Seventh. Categories would vary, as would the stipends, depending on time involved, educational and professional status and experience, numbers of dependents, cost-of-living factors, and so forth.

OEO and the Department of HEW are directed to work closely together in the development of this new program. It involves expertise common to both agencies, and both have indicated to me their willingness to begin in this fashion, with OEO given the main responsibility because of its expertise in the specific field of health care of the poor. In testimony before the subcommittee on the poverty legislation, the HEW spokesman, Assistant Secretary Lisle Carter, spoke of the close working relationship between HEW and OEO in the respective health programs of each, and cited numerous examples of joint funding and supervision.

In the health area, at least, there is close cooperation and coordination among the Federal agencies, a development calculated to bring better care to the poor. I applaud the personnel involved in making this cooperation effective.

The amendment grew out of the experience of OEO in funding summer projects involving health care for the poor in three areas across the country: California, Chicago, and New York City.

The three programs represent the most ambitious activity to date of a growing sector of the health student community: The Student Health Organizations. Student Health Organizations—SHO—have appeared over the past 3 years in major cities across the Nation. Composed of students from all of the health sciences, and seeking the advice of prominent professional and community leaders, the organizations have carried out numerous projects designed to foster leadership through service, experience and education. The SHO's have introduced the notion that the health science student, during his educational tenure, is an untapped resource for alleviating the health manpower shortage crisis in the United States. The possibility and desirability that health students might actively participate in community services while they receive their education has been a major SHO contribution. The SHO's have emphasized the importance of mobilizing students to explore creative and flexible new roles in conjunction with the public and the professions.

The value of such an approach was clearly demonstrated in the student health project of 1966, a program funded by OEO and jointly sponsored by the USC School of Medicine and the Student Medical Conference of Los Angeles. Through the 1966 project, 90 students of nursing, medicine, dentistry, dental hygiene and social work from 40 institutions in 11 States served in various capacities in poverty areas across the State of California. Each student consulted directly with a preceptor who was involved in some way with health concerns and disadvantaged populations. Students were joined in their work by 15 community workers, individuals with

marginal incomes who received the same stipend as the students.

The success of the 1966 project laid a firm foundation for the program planned for summer 1967, which has been an even greater success than the 1966 project. One hundred fifty students from all health disciplines were joined by 50 community workers and teenage health "interns" in placements throughout the State of California. Student fellows were placed in one of three areas in California. Those in the northern and southern parts of the State worked in poverty-stricken urban communities. Students in the central part of California were placed in rural settings. The project fellows worked in interdisciplinary teams combining students to medicine, dentistry, nursing, social work, and other health-related fields. Project fellows concentrated in well-defined communities in order to maximize their impact upon the community and to insure, as far as possible, that the life of the programs they developed lived beyond the summer's end.

It is against this background that the 1967 Chicago student health project was constructed.

The Chicago project focused on the problems of health and health care among the urban poor. All 100 students—including medical, nursing, dental, social work and law—worked within the city of Chicago. Placements were in Negro, Puerto Rican, Appalachian white, and Mexican-American areas. The assignments ranged from community organization around health issues, with local groups in the city's most troubled areas, to university research positions studying patterns of delivery of health care to these same regions. There were placements with Headstart schools, Chicago Board of Health facilities, Neighborhood Health Centers, university and city outpatient departments and private physicians.

In addition to the 100 health science students, the project included 50 salaried interns—16- and 17-year-old high school students from Neighborhood Youth Corps programs in areas in question. The interns worked alongside the health science students, in the same placements, as integral parts of the team.

The New York City project, operated in the South Bronx, is similar. In this area 50 health professional students and 10 community workers were concentrated this summer from June 27 through September 1. The group was drawn from the nursing, medical, dental and social work disciplines. They worked to encourage and support community efforts to deliver better health care and to effect a substantial change in medical service. The idea of maintaining continuity, that is, of training residents of the South Bronx to fill the jobs created by student fellows during the summer, was paramount in the project's outlook. The sponsors of the project, Albert Einstein College of Medicine and Montefiore Hospital, were instrumental in assuring the broad based community support.

An article in the September 25, 1967, edition of the AMA News contains a vivid description of the accomplishments of these summer medical students projects

"in improving the health conditions in ghetto areas of cities." I commend this article to those who wonder about the AMA's position on this amendment.

In short, the amendment will supplement and complement the great success of the Neighborhood Health Centers and can help make Aristotle's statement in "Politics" an American boast:

Health of mind and body is so fundamental to the good life that if we believe that men have any personal rights at all as human beings, then they have an absolute moral right to such a measure of good health as society and society alone is able to give them.

ELDERLY POOR

The elderly poor is the second major area I want to discuss.

The elderly poor, as a group, have been least affected by the general economic progress made since 1959—the earliest year for which we have comparable data. For example, in 1959, there were fewer elderly poor individuals than there are now: 2.5 million then, versus 2.7 million now.

Today, about six out of every 10 unrelated aged are poor. Today, one out of every five seniors living in a family is poor. But only one out of nine persons age 18 to 64, in families, is poor. Thirty percent of all the elderly in the United States are poor, in contrast to 17 percent for the total U.S. population. The problem is particularly acute in rural areas. Eighty percent of the poor living alone in rural areas are over 55, as opposed to 68 percent in urban areas.

We, as a nation with a gross national product approaching \$800 billion, should simply not tolerate poverty among our senior citizens. For one thing, most senior citizens have played their role in building our society—and they should have recognition for this from us, the beneficiaries of their efforts. For another, we can ease the pains of poverty and the loneliness it brings to seniors without a massive financial expenditure.

Strong evidence that this is so is readily available. In 1966, hearings in the Federal, State and Community Services Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, of the Special Committee on Aging, reviewed the successes of the OEO-funded medicare alert program, under which 12,000 seniors in 466 different projects sought out other seniors and informed them of their rights under the recently-enacted medicare program. The subcommittee issued a report recommending that the program be continued and expanded, building upon the enthusiasm of medicare alert. The National Council on the Aging responded, applying to OEO for funding of what it called Project Find, and OEO has, happily, funded the project.

What these two efforts have discovered is that the hundreds of thousands of seniors who have been reached by the projects care about such basic human services as nutritious food, better housing, regaining contact with a society which has passed them by, learning about their rights under Federal, State and local aid programs, employment, recreation and other aspects of American life. They care about them because they are not presently receiving them.

The projects have also successfully demonstrated that seniors themselves can plan effective and efficient roles as staff workers in the projects, operating under specific plans of action.

The testimony presented to the subcommittee confirms this. Representatives of many organizations spoke before the subcommittee, but few were as eloquent or as compelling as those from organizations of seniors.

Jack Ossofsky of the National Council on Aging said, for example:

But what of those fathers of generations past? They, the poor who have grown old and the old who have grown poor. They, too, need the chance for a better life embodied in the promise of the War Against Poverty, and this need is urgent, for their future is now.

John Edelman, president of the National Council of Senior Citizens, said:

The report [on Project Find] showed that among the 388 older persons interviewed, thirty-six percent were entitled to public assistance they were not getting, forty-seven percent were entitled to United States food stamps they were not buying, and forty-eight percent appeared eligible for Medicaid but had no information about this benefit.

And William Hutton, executive director of the National Council for Senior Citizens, said:

We should also make available to seniors a variety of other options, like the opportunity to continue working, to launch upon a second career, to engage in part-time or full-time study, or simply to continue working at a gradually decreasing work schedule in a gradual transition from full-time production to leisure.

The testimony of these three gentlemen does not come from studies or intuition. It comes from working with older Americans, day after day and year after year. They know what the elderly poor need and they know what the elderly poor want, and it has been my experience that they reflect accurately the hopes of the many millions of seniors they represent.

For these reasons, I proposed that a national emphasis program, somewhat similar to Project Find, be adopted as part of the OEO legislation. OEO has only reluctantly, despite consistent prodding from myself and from other Members of Congress, moved toward adopting any programs designed for the elderly poor. Figures submitted to the subcommittee, at my request, clearly indicate that the funds OEO has allocated for the elderly poor are disproportionately low. This led to one of the findings of the committee:

Once again, the Committee must report an inadequate performance in programs for the elderly, and urge OEO to take immediate steps to remedy this deficiency.

It is my hope that a national emphasis program for the elderly poor can work a dramatic change in this orientation.

My amendment, appearing as section 221(b)(6), is designed to encourage local community action agencies to develop local programs employing seniors to reach out and assist other seniors, those isolated from the currents of everyday life and unaware of what health, legal, housing and other services are available to them. I have high hopes for the suc-

cess of Project Find, and know that these hopes are shared by all those closely familiar with the fears and the needs of the older, retired, or widowed American.

There are a number of other changes this legislation effects which will have a salutary impact on the needs of the elderly poor. In the VISTA program, for example, OEO is directed to raise the participation of older volunteers and to develop more projects which serve the needs of older persons. Today, only 16 percent of VISTA volunteers are over 60 years of age. This is, in my opinion, a grave mistake: seniors are available, willing and able to serve; they need only to be organized and recognized. Other amendments direct that older persons should be made members of the governing board of the local community action agency and that older persons should be employed as staff members of local agencies.

In short, we have only begun to move toward doing for our elderly poor what we should do. OEO has not yet implemented the requirement in a 1966 amendment, which I offered, requiring special studies and programs for the elderly poor, but I intend to see that the studies are begun shortly and that program recommendations are forthcoming soon. Then, and only then, can we be sure that retirement years for seniors are not empty, but are full of meaning and enjoyment.

NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

Neighborhood organizations are the third major area I want to discuss. I introduced two amendments relating to neighborhood organizations: section 233, which authorizes the development of neighborhood centers; and section 219 (b), which authorizes the development of housing development and services organizations as specific delegate agencies.

Neighborhood centers are fast becoming the keystone in the arch of local antipoverty efforts. My purpose in proposing that the authorization for neighborhood centers be put into the statute is to encourage their widespread development in all communities and rural areas.

In 1968, OEO plans to fund, through local community action agencies, something on the order of 1,000 neighborhood centers, 700 urban and 300 rural, serving roughly 4 million people. These centers reflect a wide variety of forms: some are comprehensive service centers, some are referral centers, some are one-stop service centers, and some are small storefronts. But whatever the form, there is one central feature common to all: each center reflects the actual needs of the neighborhood, as expressed by the residents of the neighborhood. Thus, in some areas, legal services are in demand, and they can be made available through the center. In other areas or neighborhoods, conversely, day care or job referral may be in demand, and these services can be provided. It is this wide choice of services, a choice exercised by neighborhood residents which marks OEO's centers as distinct from those established by other agencies with a more restricted mandate.

The concept of neighborhoods as the focus of social action is deeply woven into the fabric of American urban and

rural life. In the early days, life centered around the neighborhood or town churches, and later, when immigration mushroomed, it grew to include the social club.

The depression and the consequent proliferation of health, welfare and educational programs, on local, State and Federal levels, changed all this. The churches and voluntary agencies became more specialized, as public programs entered the arena, and consequently the consumer of services was forced to become quite sophisticated as to the existence and location of the private and public agencies, often spread at random throughout the community.

The need to return to a neighborhood-based, comprehensive service organization has only recently been recognized. President Johnson, in August of 1966, asked the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set as his goal "the establishment—in every ghetto in America—of a neighborhood center to service the people who live there." In June of 1967, a group of Federal agencies announced pilot neighborhood center projects in 14 cities, in response to the President's speech.

America will not—and need not—wait for the funds to be made available to construct brandnew centers in every ghetto. OEO has encouraged the rental of space, as opposed to costly new construction, in an effort to get the centers in operation as soon as possible.

I think the foresight of OEO in this matter is great, and the success story of these centers should be widely told. I visited two centers in Roxbury, a ghetto area in Boston, and when the rioting broke out during the summer in Roxbury, these two centers were spared, while buildings close on either side were burned out. The reason, I think, is that those centers were a visible indication that someone cared about the people of Roxbury, and cared enough to ask the people what they needed and wanted.

This program, it is important to note, does not in any way compete with that authorized by section 703 of the Housing Act of 1965—the neighborhood facilities grant program administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Rather, OEO's neighborhood center program supplements it. OEO can provide the funds for planning and operating a center; HUD supplies the construction funds. Thus, the two programs dovetail neatly.

The second amendment relating to neighborhood organizations is the inclusion, within the section encouraging the use of delegate agencies to carry out the components of the community action program, of one specific type of delegate agency—housing development and service organizations.

In the last 5 years, a number of new kinds of housing programs have become available. These programs, administered by the Federal Housing Administration, provide interest-rate subsidies for the provision of low- and moderate-income housing, and rent supplements for the provision of low-income housing. These programs require a sponsor which is either a nonprofit or limited-dividend corporation, or a cooperative organiza-

tion. The sponsor itself organizes and manages the project. FHA processes the application and provides direct assistance under the program.

The results of these housing programs are paradoxical. On the one hand, the amount of money available is small. But on the other hand, available funds have not been fully utilized. The administrative and financial skills required, and the seed money needed, have simply been too much for most nonprofit groups to muster. Well intentioned and energetic though they may be, these groups have just not been able to hire the personnel or raise the money needed to bring such projects successfully to conclusion through the regulations and complications which the programs require.

Housing professionals generally agree that an upgrading of the nonprofit sponsor is necessary if such programs are ever to work. The nonprofit housing development corporation is a device often mentioned in this context. OEO has been experimenting with these corporations—through section 205 community action grants and section 207 demonstration grants—in a wide variety of situations, from the neighborhood level on the one hand, to the semiregional on the other. The housing development corporations, at the city, metropolitan, and semiregional levels, are concentrating on the "packaging" problem.

To date, OEO has funded 11 of the Housing Development Corporations, in New York City; Durham, N.C.; Cleveland, Ohio; Washington, D.C.; Baltimore, Md.; St. Louis, Mo.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Denver, Colo. and Whitesburg, Ky. OEO's financial involvement in the seven corporations which, to date, have had their mortgages committed, is \$1,900,000; the value of the housing being constructed is \$68,900,000. This is, to my mind, dramatic evidence of the multiplier effect of OEO's seed money in this area, and it convinced me that this tentative, experimental program should be made a specific part of OEO's legislation.

For housing development, these corporations bring together the lawyers, architects, real estate and construction specialists needed to prepare applications for the Federal Housing Authority and to shepherd them through the processing stages. Equally important, they provide entrepreneurial drive which the private market has yet to supply for low-income housing. Both these functions require skill and access to capital, capital which can be recovered when permanent financing is secured, but without which projects are impossible to develop. By aggregating such resources, the development corporation becomes a new base of support for other institutions. The existing nonprofit groups—churches, labor unions and civic associations—can draw on these new institutions for talents which they have been unable to muster themselves, and they in turn become the formal mortgagor entity envisaged by statute.

As one specific example of the success of OEO's experimental efforts, consider the case of the Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation in Philadelphia.

OEO made a grant of \$160,000* to the Corporation, which in turn generated a \$2,000,000 revolving fund. This revolving fund then generated \$10,000,000 in mortgages in process, which translates to 850 low-income housing units actually under construction. The important of the \$160,000 initial grant lies in the very high "front-end" cash cost which must be laid out before a mortgage can be obtained. Many Federal housing programs are so complex that architects, real-estate experts, lawyers, administrators, and finance men all must be consulted before an application can even be drawn up. This front-end cost has forced many nonprofit sponsors to shy away from using the low-income housing programs. But when the front-end cost can be obtained, then these local sponsors have little difficulty in borrowing the remaining costs.

My amendment, then, simply encourages the creation of the local institutional structure with which the Government can deal. In his testimony, the Director of OEO, Sargent Shriver, described the need for this local structure in these terms:

Our government and society is so set up that unless a fellow has got the right kind of a catcher's mitt, he cannot even get the ball the other guy is throwing.

Now, with this amendment, catcher's mitts will be available.

In short, what I have tried to do so to strengthen the role of the neighborhood-based organization in the poverty program. The neighborhood is the right place, in my mind, for services for the poor—who only rarely have transportation—to be made available. It is my hope that the progress OEO has already made in this direction will be accelerated.

INCREASE IN COMMUNITY ACTION FUNDS

I would like to explain, briefly, one other amendment. The committee added a number of new programs to title II of the OEO legislation, including Project Find. It is my belief that the authorization should consequently be raised to reflect the addition of these new items, and not held down to the level requested when these programs were not part of the legislation. Consequently, I offered an amendment to raise the authorization for title II by \$40 million.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

I consider the Emergency Employment Act of 1967, recommended by the committee, landmark legislation. We now have, as the lucid two-page statement in the report accompanying the bill indicates, the opportunity to vote on a measure recommended by three different Presidential commissions, by the urban coalition, and endorsed by almost seven out of 10 Americans. If the need for this measure is so clear to Presidential panels and to the American public alike, I fail to see how the Senate can, in conscience, do anything but accept it.

Can we be so indifferent to the call of need? Can we ignore the lessons of the past two summers? Can we be unmindful of the need?

I believe that the perspective of history will reveal the vote on the Emergency Employment Act as a measure of the concern of the U.S. Senate for the well-being

of our national life. I also believe that those who vote against it are voting against the best interests of the Nation and of its people. There can be no viable American society so long as jobs, and the income they produce, are denied to those men and women who want to work.

I would also make the point that this is an authorization bill and not an appropriations bill. Consequently, voting to accept the Emergency Employment Act as recommended by the committee will not cost anyone so much as a dime. What it will show, however, is that the U.S. Senate is not unaware or unmindful of the recommendations of some of this country's best minds, as well as 70 percent of its people.

When riots occur, the national conscience is shocked. Yet voices have for years warned that urban ghettos are crucibles of discontent and alienation, and breeding grounds for violent outbreaks of frustration. These same voices say that employment is, among young men, the single most important factor in soothing the frustrations.

What do riots cost? We can, perhaps, measure the cost in dollars and cents of physical damage. But can we ever measure the cost in national prestige? In lives? In young men and women who will never feel the same about the American way of life? In the willingness of small businessmen to locate in ghettos?

What the Emergency Employment Act does is to authorize \$2.8 billion spread over 2 fiscal years, 1968 and 1969, to create public service jobs. This is a small price to pay, I think, when stacked up against the true costs of past or possible future riots. It is, too, pale in comparison to the space budget, the Federal highway budget, or to many others.

We should ask ourselves, what will be the cost of delaying a year in sending a man to the moon? Or, what will be the cost of delaying for a year a few miles of urban freeway?

This is the frame of reference for debate on this bill. We are talking not about a capital investment in physical facilities—we are talking about a capital investment in human beings. These human beings are not passive, and it is they who will make or break the future of this country. If there is any clear message of the past two summers, I think it is that our investment, to date, in human beings, has been far too small. The gulf between the affluent American and the poor American is widening—and it is this gulf which has rubbed raw the sores of 300 years of deprivation.

CONCLUSION

There is one last area I would like to discuss—the issue of control of the program. "Increase local control; untie the Federal strings"—how often have we heard that cry? Yet, when charges were leveled this summer that local poverty workers were involved in the riots, these same critics cried: "Tighten up the controls." Now, let me ask: When will these critics make up their minds? For we cannot have it both ways. We cannot tighten Federal controls and loosen them at the same time.

I, for one, have made up mine: I think the local control in design and operation

of poverty programs is unprecedented in extent and crucial to its success. Poverty is simply not subject to the contours of a grand design; the poverty program, in this regard, is totally different from the Federal highway program, which is susceptible to national standards and criteria. I think the extent of local control is important and meaningful, and I reject out of hand the assertion that the program is controlled in Washington, and that local programs cannot show initiative.

The poverty program is without parallel as an innovative Federal effort at unraveling a problem as complex as society itself. I am, as one who participated in the development of the initial program and the subsequent years' amendments, proud of what it has done. I know the road ahead is long and difficult, but I think the changes made in this year's bill are constructive and will help us down that road with firm conviction and deliberate speed.

Mr. President, I would like once again to express my admiration for the work of the distinguished floor manager of the bill [Mr. CLARK]. He is in no small measure personally responsible for the vast amount of thought which went into the development of this bill, and I commend him for his leadership.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the senior Senator from Massachusetts for his fine statement.

Senator KENNEDY's aid and support throughout the subcommittee's examination of the war on poverty. Senator KENNEDY held extensive hearings in Massachusetts. He was particularly helpful in the subcommittee's hearings of administration witnesses and in drawing up the legislation which is now pending.

Senator KENNEDY's amendments in the areas of health, housing, neighborhood centers, and the elderly have greatly strengthened the bill and the poverty program.

I thank the Senator for his support and his kind comments.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the Ribicoff-Percy amendment to the instructions of the motion of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the proponents of the amendment and the junior Senator from West Virginia, the sponsor of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 367.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment (No. 367) offered by Mr. RIBICOFF, for himself and Mr. PERCY.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 367) is as follows:

In lieu of the motion by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia to strike out title II, I move to strike title II and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT"

"SHORT TITLE"

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Emergency Employment Act of 1967'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE"

"SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds that certain communities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by severe unemployment and underemployment. Such areas contain large concentrations or proportions of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular competitive employment because of lack of education, occupational skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement. This situation is aggravated by migration of unskilled rural residents to urban areas. Many of the affected areas are doubly handicapped by the lack of sufficient jobs for all the potential labor force. This condition is destructive of human dignity and results in a loss of national productivity. In many localities the problem has reached crisis proportion by contributing to social unrest and civil disorder.

"(b) At the same time there is a huge backlog of need for additional public services and public facilities in such fields as those which (1) contribute to the development of human potential, (2) better the conditions under which people live, learn, and work, and (3) aid in the development and conservation of natural resources.

"(c) Therefore, it is the purpose of this title to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest by fulfilling unmet needs.

"ELIGIBLE AREAS"

"SEC. 203. The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the 'Secretary') shall designate urban and rural areas to be eligible for assistance under this title. Such areas shall contain a high concentration or proportion of low-income families and individuals and shall have severe problems of unemployment and underemployment. They may be defined without regard to political boundaries.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE"

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations for part or all of the costs of programs which create meaningful public service and other employment opportunities. He shall adopt procedures to assure (1) that there is maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility with full participation of and maximum cooperation among local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and representatives of private organizations in the establishment of programs under this title, including, without limitation, the determina-

tion of areas and participants eligible for assistance and the selection of projects under subsection (b) of this section, and (2) that such assistance is fully coordinated with programs operated under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal Acts.

"(b) Jobs created or made available under this title may include services and supporting facilities in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such jobs shall include (1) those which can be made available immediately to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain employment, (2) those which provide placement resources for persons completing training under titles I and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and other relevant manpower training programs, and (3) those which use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic labor surplus. Priority shall be given to projects which are labor intensive in character.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to assure that (1) persons employed in jobs created by this title are provided opportunity for further education, training, and necessary supportive services, including those provided by other relevant Acts, so that they may be prepared to obtain regular competitive employment in the future; and (2) that maximum effort is made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons.

"LOANS"

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans to public and private agencies for the purchase of supplies and equipment which support and supplement projects carried out by participants under section 204.

"(b) Loans authorized under this section may be made without interest and under such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS"

"SEC. 206. Participants in programs under this title must be unemployed or low-income persons who reside in eligible areas and who meet other criteria prescribed by the Secretary. Low income shall be defined in terms of section 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS"

"SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this title unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or results in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) wages paid a participant shall not be lower than, whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or

(C) the prevailing rate of wages in the area for similar work.

"(4) the program will, to the extent appropriate, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs related to physical improvements preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families in urban neighborhoods or rural areas having concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this title have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"(d) Programs approved under this title shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

"REPORTS"

"SEC. 208. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress made in implementing this title and suggestions for improvements on or before May 15, 1968, November 15, 1968, and on or before May 15 and November 15 of each year thereafter.

"EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT FUND"

"SEC. 209. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States an Emergency Employment Fund. To provide capital for such fund, the President is authorized to allocate to such fund an amount not to exceed 2 per centum of the funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, which are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be available to carry out Federal programs which are not directly and primarily related to the national defense. Sums so allocated to such fund shall be available to the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this title."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia renew his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, while the creation of an emergency employment program has my enthusiastic support, I believe we can accomplish this goal without spending any additional Federal money.

Amendment No. 367, which the junior Senator from Illinois has cosponsored with me, authorizes the President to transfer up to 2 percent of nondefense moneys from the current budget into an emergency employment fund.

The 1968 budget calls for \$55 billion in nondefense spending. Two percent of this sum would yield \$1.1 billion—the amount that title II of S. 2388 would authorize each year to create employment opportunities in public service areas.

Mr. President, the most obvious fact in America is that a good job at an adequate wage is the key to providing self-respect for an individual and progress for a nation.

Yet unemployment in our central cities is twice the national rate. A recent Labor Department survey of 10 big city slums showed that 1 of every 3 persons was unable to earn a living. The same study also found that unemployed

among Negroes between the ages of 16 and 19 was as high as 40 percent.

If this severe employment problem existed at a time when there were no tasks waiting to be performed, no jobs that needed to be done, that would be one thing. But that is not the case.

There are today a total of 5.3 million potential jobs in the public service field alone, according to the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Under the provisions of title II, meaningful employment opportunities would be provided in such fields as health, recreation, public safety, education, beautification, municipal services, and neighborhood development and improvement.

Jobs are the number one priority in America today. Survey after survey proves that much of the violence that has struck our cities stems from unemployment, and that disorder often comes from persons who feel they have no stake in society.

However, this is also a time when our national financial commitments are strained to the utmost. It is obvious that Congress and the executive branch are in no mood to vote additional expenditures. But the need for jobs is our No. 1 priority. Other expenditures can be deferred. I am sure that 2 percent can be found in items of less priority in the domestic budget. Here is an opportunity to give priority where the need is greatest.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the issue before us is a very simple one. Hardly a day goes by that we do not hear either from an urban specialist or academician, a mayor, or a ghetto resident that an immediate priority in our urban areas is jobs. And who amongst us can deny this? Is not man's most valuable asset his ability to find and maintain meaningful employment? At the present time there are 3 million able bodied men and women on the streets of America looking for jobs, but it is a hopeless search for the jobs which they seek and are prepared to fill do not exist. Ironically, at the same time, there are millions of positions going begging for lack of adequately trained persons to fill them. The frustrations to the community as a whole and the indignities to the person as an individual that this situation engenders are obvious. I need not repeat them here.

Even the most ardent supporter of title II of the bill under consideration will admit that it does not offer the final or long range solution to the unemployment problems of our nation. As a realistic advocate of the program I argue that we have an emergency situation to deal with as well as a long term one.

This program is, as its name implies, an emergency program. It should be judged on those terms. I do not advocate that it take the place of existing or future long range programs.

I am certain that everyone in this Chamber knows the value of manpower training and retraining and most of us realize what a tangled mess the Federal manpower programs are now in. There presently exist over 79 Federal training

and education programs administered by 15 different agencies and bureaus. The real tragedy is that one finds example after example of completely uncoordinated training programs and of men and women training for jobs which do not exist. Welfare mothers tell me stories of leaving their children home alone at night in order to participate in a Federal training program and then, after graduation, not being able to find work in the field for which they have prepared themselves at government suggestion. Others tell of taking basic education courses which bring them up to a sixth-grade level in reading and writing, but then discovering that a ninth grade literacy level is needed to qualify for a job training program.

In not assuring that these programs are properly and efficiently administered this Congress and, to a greater degree, this administration is guilty of dashing untold numbers of personal dreams and ambitions on the part of low-income citizens. In a real sense the Great Society has failed its people. Now it must begin to make up for this failure by giving some of its citizens a little extra help.

The emergency job program will do just this. It will give an extra boost to those who need it the most. This program offers much more than a job and a steady income. The program, by providing employment, offers dignity to the individual, stability to the family and hope to the community.

All this being so, it is too much to ask that this administration accept the emergency job program as a priority and cut back on other less pressing, less immediate and less efficient programs? I think not.

The amendment which Senator RIBICOFF and I have offered today would give the President the authority to set the priorities in his administration by cutting back some less important programs. He would be authorized to use up to \$1.1 billion of the resultant savings the first year to fund the Emergency Employment Act.

As strongly as I believe that such a job program is necessary I just as strongly believe it would be wrong for us to authorize an additional \$2.8 billion at this time even for so high a priority item as jobs. With a projected deficit of \$25 to \$30 billion and with full proposed 10 percent surcharge which would bring in less than \$5 billion this fiscal year, we have no choice but to pull in our belts. An average American family of four with a \$7,000 income could certainly cut back 2 percent of their budget, or \$116, if necessary to meet a new urgent need rather than just spending its money adding to its debt. Why should we not do the same thing in government?

If we do not, the resultant inflation will impose a stiff penalty on millions of American families, acting most harshly, as inflation does, on the poor.

With a \$135 billion budget, no one can argue that there is not plenty of room to tighten our fiscal belts. This Government is like so many Americans—it keeps talking about going on a diet, but it is all talk for the scales never show a loss of weight. Every year the President prom-

ises economies and every year we have a larger and larger budget. The more we talk about dieting, the fatter it gets.

The President often criticizes the Congress for not permitting him to economize. Let us say to the President—we now authorize you to cut back 2 percent on nondefense spending and to use these funds to meet an emergency situation in our Nation. Let us assure him that the American people are willing to economize on other important programs in order to help those in our midst who need emergency assistance.

Mr. President, not just as Senators, but as Americans, let us wake up to the need and set our priorities. What is more important than the dignity and fulfillment of meaningful employment?

I therefore, Mr. President, offer co-sponsorship and support for the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut which is now before the Senate, as a possible means of meeting this emergency situation by providing legislation that will end on June 30, 1968, to deal with this immediate future period, which we do consider an emergency period insofar as it involves the necessity of providing jobs for Americans who urgently need useful and gainful employment, and the sense of dignity that can only come with a job and a chance to earn one's own living.

We offer this amendment as a means of shifting priorities from less essential items to an essential item of high priority and urgent need, in both our rural and urban communities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I do not question the purpose and intent of the pending amendment. The purposes are good. I have great respect for both of these dedicated Senators. However, speaking as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I think the Senate should have a word of caution.

I do not care who the President is or to what party he might belong, when we transfer to the President the power to determine priorities, after both our branches of the Congress and the Appropriations Committees and the committees of conference have thrashed out and determined the priorities on behalf of the Congress—in which body the Constitution vests this power and responsibility—we are liable to run into a good deal of trouble.

In principle I think it is a violation of constitutional intent, but I also would suggest to the Senate that it might find itself very much disappointed in the possible results.

We have just been going through a long committee of conference on the appropriation bill for Labor-HEW. The committee felt with respect to that appropriation bill that a certain amount of money should go to impacted school areas. The committee felt that a certain amount should go to a long-established and well-working program of national defense education funds in which I think almost every superintendent of

schools and school principal in the country are interested.

The President, I am quite sure, is not in sympathy with those programs at this time.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation has seen fit to add funds for air safety, for the policing of the air, for observation, for personnel, and for devices to insure the safety of those flying. The President does not approve of the addition of those funds.

It would be all right if the 2-percent leeway were restricted to the poverty program, to shifting programs within the poverty program itself. However, when we transfer to the President the power to establish priorities all along the line on nondefense spending, we will suddenly wake up and find that our studied, final decision on very delicate and sensitive matters will have been nullified by our own action.

We will begin to hear from our school officials and those who are vitally interested in the development of airports and air safety. We will hear from the people.

The committees in both bodies of Congress have acted upon the matter. I feel that in spite of the good objectives of the pending amendment, to take this unprecedented step of surrendering to the Executive the power to establish priorities after we have gone clear through the legislative process—from the House committee to the House, from the Senate committee to the Senate, and from there to the conference committee, and finally to a decision—would be a very dangerous precedent to set.

I must oppose the amendment.

I am not authorized to speak for the members of the Appropriations Committee. However, I believe it will be found that almost every member of that committee feels this would set an extremely dangerous precedent.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is true that the action we seek to achieve is unprecedented. However, we live in unprecedented times.

It becomes very obvious as we study the basic problems of the cities of America that the key problem today is jobs. That is the view of everyone, whether they be sociologists, mayors, or people living in the ghettos.

It is also apparent that the Congress is reluctant either to spend the money and appropriate the funds, or to raise taxes to supply the funds needed for programs such as this.

Under such circumstances, we must make a choice. If we are unwilling to raise taxes and are unwilling to appropriate the money, then I believe we have a duty to start setting priorities. And if we ourselves are unwilling to set certain priorities, I see nothing wrong with allowing these priorities to be set by the President of the United States.

We should keep in mind that, whether we will it or not, the President of the

United States does have the authority to withhold spending if he is dissatisfied with—or finds that he does not have the funds with which to carry out—programs that Congress authorized.

I recall that in 1961, after Congress had adjourned, the late President Kennedy—I having been a member of his Cabinet—called the Cabinet together and asked us to hold back on the spending of various appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, as the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I did withhold the spending of a substantial sum of money. If my memory serves me right, it involved a sum of \$100 million in funds that Congress had voted to appropriate. And no one raised the question of whether the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the President of the United States had the authority to withhold these funds.

We have a basic problem that we must decide. We should either vote the money and raise the taxes; or, if we are unwilling to take these steps, we should set priorities.

The needs are present and very great. This program is so important that we should at least give the President the authority to determine the priorities that are so vital to the future of our country.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said is perfectly true. We do have precedents, I think, for impounding and withholding funds.

I do not know that the courts have ever passed on that privilege. However, in a sense it is exercising an item veto.

Let us concede that it is true. No one has questioned it. However, it is one thing to withhold money and not spend it. It is quite another thing to have the ability and the power to decide that some particular program that Congress has decided is highly important is not important or not as important as others, and to take money from that program and expend it in a way that Congress did not see fit to authorize.

I agree with the Senator. I commend him for what he has to say. Congress has not met its responsibility either in holding down expenditures or in being careful about priorities.

I have much sympathy with the position of the Senator from Connecticut and the junior Senator from Illinois. However, merely because we do not face up to our responsibilities in one respect, we are not going to improve things by transferring to the President of the United States the right to exercise this power. Congress might as well go home, if that is going to be its future policy.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I point out that there are 250 programs in the Federal Government today that deal with the problems of the city. That is the informal count we have received from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Last year the mayor of Oakland appeared before our Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization and said that they had taken an inventory and found that there were some 140 Federal programs in which the city of Oakland alone was involved.

I have before me the catalog of the Federal assistance programs put out by the Office of Economic Opportunity. This newest catalog lists 459 channels through which Federal help and dollars can flow to cities, States, and individuals.

We are in a ridiculous situation. We pass program after program, and the executive branch of the Government and the Congress are equally at fault.

For we rarely stop to think about what America needs most. We keep voting piecemeal programs until they become astronomical in number and in amount. We think they will solve everything. Yet when we look at the problems, in depth, we finally realize that we can make our greatest impact on problems of poverty and disorder in our cities by providing job opportunities.

In 1966, the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress studied this problem. They pointed out that there were 5.3 million potential jobs in the public service field. In medical institutions and health services, there were 1.2 million; in educational institutions, 1.1 million; in national beautification, 1.3 million; in welfare and home care, 700,000; in public protection, 350,000; in urban renewal and sanitation, 650,000—some 5.3 million jobs, that were not leaf-raking and "make-work" tasks, but were both productive and in the public interest.

When you consider the rate of unemployment in our central cities, and when you study the riots across America, you see that teenaged youngsters, without jobs, often are in the forefront of the riots. We must realize that jobs are the important key to the self-respect that can help eliminate violence and help solve the crisis of the cities.

I believe that the program submitted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a worthwhile program. But the weakness of that program is that at a time of national stress and national shortage of funds, they are voting \$2.8 billion. We, as realistic men, know that Congress will not spend \$2.8 billion. But if jobs are as important as the committee says—and I agree that they are—then we have a duty to determine how we will set and reach this priority.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have great regard for the comments made by

the Senator from New Hampshire. I certainly respect the judgments of members of the Committee on Appropriations. I have a reverence for the operation procedures that have been developed over a period of many years in this body.

But I believe that sometimes emergency conditions require carefully calculated and carefully controlled innovations. The control placed upon this innovation would be that it would be subject to the discretion of the President. It would not involve additional funds. It would involve a transfer of funds. It would be strictly limited to 1 year. The authority would end on June 30, 1968. We have an election coming up, and I have great faith in the electoral process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PERCY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERCY. The able Senator from New Hampshire has rightfully indicated that if the President chose to cut back, say, the air safety program or the school milk program, you would have enraged citizens, and you would have school superintendents making complaints to Congress. But the man who would be responsible for making that decision would be the President. Presumably, he would be running for reelection, and he would be held accountable for having made that decision. I believe we can have sufficient confidence in the President of the United States—one of the only two officers elected by all the people of this country—to use discretion, to consider this an emergency, to apply these funds only as would be prescribed in the measure, and to put them to work where those conditions exist today that have created in our cities an emergency condition.

We have talked a great deal about the long, hot summers, but they come only once a year. When I met yesterday with the leaders of nine of the Youth Corps centers in New York, each of them in turn said, "Now, this authority for the summer jobs is over, but where are the boys? Back on the streets." Perhaps the weather is cooler, but the condition is just as bad as it was before, and we need something that is year-round; because the frustration, the bitterness, and the discontent exist year-round. The hot summers are just the top of the iceberg. The remainder, which is not showing, is the fact that society has somehow not met the need of these people, who do want work but do not have the skill and training for one reason or another—perhaps because of their fault, perhaps the fault of society, or perhaps a combined fault.

This emergency situation calls for some innovation. This is a carefully controlled situation. If it did not work, we could easily cancel the authority. The authority would not be extended beyond June 30, 1968. Certainly, we would hold the President accountable for every decision he made. His commission, which already has been appointed, has indicated in-

formally and in conversations that housing and jobs are the two most urgent problems they face. We are simply trying to find a way to meet the problems without adding to the deficit, without adding to the fires of inflation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] be permitted to speak for not to exceed 3 minutes, to submit a conference report, and that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF JUDGMENT FUNDS DEPOSITED TO THE CREDIT OF THE CHEYENNE-ARAPAHO TRIBES OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask that the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate a message from the House on S. 1933, a bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1933) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to distribute and expend the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma that were appropriated by the Act of October 31, 1965 (79 Stat. 1133), in satisfaction of the settlement and compromise of claims of said tribes against the United States in the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 329A and 329B, together with the interest accrued thereon, as herein provided.

SEC. 2. Five hundred thousand dollars of said funds shall be held in trust for the purpose of providing education and scholarships for members of said tribes pursuant to a trust agreement to be made and entered into by and between said tribes, as grantor, and a national banking association located in the State of Oklahoma, as trustee, which trust agreement shall be authorized and approved by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall distribute remaining funds per capita to all persons alive on the date of this Act whose names appear on the membership roll of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma or who, on the date of this Act, were eligible for membership, hereinafter referred to as "enrollees", as follows:

(a) a share payable to an enrollee not less than twenty-one years of age shall be paid directly in one payment to such enrollee, except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section;

(b) a share payable to an enrollee dying after the date of this Act shall be distributed to his heirs or legatees upon the filing of proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, whose findings and determinations upon such proof shall be final and conclusive: *Provided, That if a share*

of such deceased enrollee, or a portion thereof, is payable to an heir or legatee under twenty-one years of age or under legal disability, the same shall be paid and held in trust pursuant to subsection (c) of this section;

(c) a share or proportional share payable to an enrollee or person under twenty-one years of age or to an enrollee or person under legal disability shall be paid and held in trust for such enrollee or person pursuant to a trust agreement to be made and entered into by and between the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma, as grantor, and a national banking association located in the State of Oklahoma, as trustee, which trust agreement shall be authorized and approved by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. (a) All claims for per capita shares, whether by a living enrollee or by the heirs or legatees of a deceased enrollee, shall be filed with the area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Anadarko, Oklahoma, not later than three years from the date of approval of this Act. Thereafter, all claims and the right to file same shall be forever barred and the unclaimed shares shall revert to the tribes.

(b) Tribal funds that revert to the tribes pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, including interest and income therefrom, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body.

SEC. 5. No part of any funds distributed or held in trust under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 6. Funds distributed and payments made under this Act shall not be held to be "other income and resources" as that term is used in sections 2(a)(10)(A), 402(a)(7), 1002(a)(8), and 1402(a)(8) of the Social Security Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 302(a)(10)(A), 602(a)(7), 1202(a)(8), and 1352(a)(8)).

SEC. 7. (a) All costs incident to making the payments authorized by this Act, including the costs of payment roll preparation and such sums as may be required to distribute said funds, shall be paid by appropriate withdrawals from the judgment fund and interest on the judgment fund, using the interest fund first.

(b) In the event that the sum of money reserved by the Secretary of the Interior to pay the costs of distributing said funds exceeds the amount actually necessary to accomplish this purpose, the money remaining shall revert to the tribes and may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized and approved by the tribal governing body.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4 of the amendment adopted by the House, strike section 6 in its entirety.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, the Members of the Senate will recall that as introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] for himself and his colleague, Senator MONRONEY, S. 1933 had in it section 6, which provides that funds distributed under the act, amounting to some \$15 million, should not be held to be "other income" under the Social Security Act and hence subject to contribution under that law. However, after hearings on S. 1933 conducted by the Indian Affairs

Subcommittee of the Interior Committee on August 9, the committee concurred in the recommendation of the Department of the Interior that the section be deleted.

The Department pointed out that it had consistently maintained that Indians are entitled to receive assistance under the Social Security Act on the same basis as non-Indians. Acceptance of this position has been achieved.

But acceptance of benefits under the act carries with it assumption of responsibilities. Payments to the fund from which benefits are received is such a responsibility.

Thus, the deletion of section 6 from the bill was still another step forward in making Indians full-fledged American citizens, ready, willing, and able to accept responsibilities as well as benefits.

The committee was assured by responsible spokesmen for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribe of Oklahoma that the tribe was willing to accept S. 1933 as amended it.

However, the companion bill in the other body, H.R. 11847, was passed on September 18 with the provision exempting the per capita distribution funds from contribution under the social security law, and the text of the House-passed bill substituted for the text of S. 1933 as amended and approved by the Senate on August 21. The amendment I am proposing would, in effect, reinstate the Senate language.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on the basis of the position of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes in favor of the Senate position as the best way to secure the most rapid passage of this measure, I join in the motion just made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent that certain correspondence and communications from those tribes be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CLINTON, OKLA.,
August 22, 1967.

Hon. FRED R. HARRIS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: Thank you for your work on S. 1933. Business committee now favors the complete omission of section six in order to expedite passage. We will want House to pass the Senate version and will notify EDMONSON by letter. Will you secure the flag used yesterday over the Senate for the tribes? This may be a presumptuous request but I know you understand their patriotism to our Nation with all American Indians. The flag will have great meaning to the members of the tribes and I will appreciate it if you can fulfill this request.

Very sincerely,

LAWRENCE H. HART.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request passage of S. 1933 as amended Cheyenne-Arapaho Business Com-

mittee by formal action favors deletion of section six. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE HART,
Cheyenne-Arapaho Chairman.
CONCHO, OKLA.

CHEYENNE AND ARAPAHO TRIBES,
August 23, 1967.

Re: S. 1933
Senator FRED R. HARRIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: The Business Committee of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma met on August 21, 1967 to consider the Senate passage of S. 1933 as amended.

After a careful and thorough deliberation the Business Committee resolved to accept the Senate version. We feel that this will help to expedite passage by Congress. We also are impressed with the reasoning to the objection of Section Six. We concur with the objection and as an alternative we intend to cooperate fully with the Department of Public Welfare of the State of Oklahoma.

I want to thank you for your work on S. 1933. Your testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs for and in behalf of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma was most impressive.

Very truly yours,

LAWRENCE H. HART,
Chairman, Cheyenne-Arapaho
Business Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 223) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1308. An act to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

H.R. 5943. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps;

H.R. 8632. An act to amend section 40c(1)

and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to re-allocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund;

H.R. 9796. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.; and

H.R. 12910. An act to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1308. An act to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4772. An act to authorize the Secretaries concerned to direct the initiation of allotments of the pay and allowances of certain members of the Armed Forces for the purpose of making deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code;

H.R. 4903. An act to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

H.R. 5943. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps;

H.R. 9796. An act to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence and new loans, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11767. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands comprising the U.S. Naval Station, Long Beach, Calif.; and

H.R. 12910. An act to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8632. An act to amend section 40c(1) and 52a of the Bankruptcy Act so as to re-allocate part of the filing fee from the clerk's earnings to the referees' salary and expense fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] be recognized for not to exceed 3 minutes, for the submission of a conference report, and that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy.

ACQUISITION OF CAREER STATUS BY TEMPORARY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1320) to provide for

the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of Sept. 27, 1967, p. H12582, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I believe we have worked out a good bill. Both the House and Senate versions of the bill were designed to provide for the conversion of certain long-term temporary

employees in the classified and postal service to career status. Both committees held hearings on this legislation and heard testimony from the Civil Service Commission, the Post Office Department, and interested Federal employees and Federal employee organizations.

We have ironed out certain basic policy differences between the House and Senate versions. After a full and free conference, and after a cooperative session with our counterparts from the House of Representatives, we are able to recommend a final version which will eliminate a serious inequity in present law and generally improve the efficiency of the civil service.

The conference report provides for the conversion of temporary indefinite or TAPER employees to career status if they have 3 years' continuous service, pass a suitable noncompetitive civil service examination, are otherwise eligible and

qualified for the position, and receive a recommendation from their agency for conversion to a career appointment. In the case of postal employees, the legal ratio of five regular employees for each one substitute will be maintained, and conversions will take place only when suitable vacancies occur.

The Whitten amendment, imposing a limitation on the total number of permanent employees in the Government, which was enacted in 1951 and which has been revised from time to time since then, is repealed.

At this point I would like to have inserted in the RECORD an analysis of the differences between the House and Senate bills and a statement of the agreement on each point reached by the conference.

There being no objection, the analysis and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate version	S. 1320—TAPER APPOINTMENTS CONFERENCE TYPE OF APPOINTMENTS House version	Conference agreement
Senate excludes any term appointment, overseas limited appointments and supergrades	House excludes any term appointment and supergrades	Senate provision adopted
1. Four years' service 2. Suitable non-competitive examinations 3. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is "equivalent" to employees appointed competitively. 4. General eligibility and qualification	CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS 1. Three years' service 2. Suitable noncompetitive, unassembled examination 3. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is "satisfactory." 4. General eligibility and current qualification.	Conferees have agreed to: (1) Three years' service; (2) Noncompetitive examination; (3) Recommendation by superior and certification of "satisfactory" service; (4) General eligibility and qualification.
Has a different section of the bill unrelated to classified service, to amend postal statutes (title 39) rather than government employees statutes generally (title 5)	POSTAL EMPLOYEES Postal employees are included in amendments to title 5.	Postal employees included in title 39; other employees included in title 5.
1. Four years' service 2. 700 hours satisfactory work each year. 3. Suitable noncompetitive exam. 4. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is equivalent to employees appointed competitively.	CONVERSION REQUIREMENTS FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES 1. Three years' service 2. 700 hours satisfactory work each year. 3. Suitable noncompetitive unassembled exam. 4. Recommendation by superior and certification that work is "satisfactory"	Conferees have agreed to: (1) Three years' service; (2) 700 hours' satisfactory work each year; (3) Noncompetitive examination; (4) Recommendation by superior and certification of "satisfactory" service.
Senate requires conversions be "stock-piled" awaiting vacancies. Regular 5 to 1 ratio will continue in full effect.	RATIO OF REGULARS TO SUBSTITUTES House waives ratio requirement but postmaster must certify that other substitutes having career appointments will not lose any regular work.	Senate provision adopted.
Senate limits permanent appointments to number necessary "required for the efficiency of the Federal Civil Service."	WHITTEN AMENDMENT House has no limiting language.	Senate provision adopted.
Senate provides 120-day grace period for the first group of employees not recommended for conversion before they are automatically separated.	EFFECTIVE DATES House has 90-day grace period.	House provision adopted.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs,

to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, so frequently do I find myself in sympathy with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] that it is with great reluctance I find it necessary to oppose the amendment they have offered, although I am highly sym-

pathetic to the principles which inspired it. As a matter of fact, I had offered the same amendment in committee and it was rejected.

Mr. President, since that time I have changed my mind on this matter because I think, as the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire has so eloquently expressed it, this amendment would abrogate the appropriation process which has been in the Congress for these many years.

If we leave this matter up to the administration to determine where funds are going to be removed from other programs and transfer them to the poverty

program, I am sure we are going to find that many programs which we have all supported in our own districts and elsewhere will be nullified. I think it is the responsibility of Congress to determine where money is going to be appropriated, how, and for what programs. We would violate that concept under the proposed amendment.

In addition, I am opposed to the measure because, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania, I shall offer an amendment later on which I hope a majority of the Senate will consider constructive, and a compromise which a majority on both sides can accept.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, there is nothing more I can add to what has been said except to say that at the Republican policy luncheon this noon, many members of the Committee on Appropriations expressed deep concern over the procedure suggested by my two distinguished colleagues. For that reason, and for other reasons, I hope very much that the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with some regret, because the proposal is rather alluring, I am opposed to the Ribicoff-Percy amendment.

The key clause is section 209, which establishes in the Treasury an emergency employment fund. The section further provides:

To provide capital for such fund, the President is authorized to allocate to such fund not to exceed 2 per centum of any unobligated funds, appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, which are determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be available to carry out Federal programs which are not directly and primarily related to the national defense.

This proposal, to me, is quite unrealistic. In the first place, it circumvents the already swollen defense appropriations. If any money is to be cut to provide funds for the Emergency Employment Act, that is where they should come from.

I think the debates on the military authorization bills and the Military Ap-

propriation Act have shown quite conclusively, at least to my satisfaction, that the military-industrial-scientific complex, which has pretty nearly taken over this country, has gotten appropriations for the vast expansion of military activities which are definitely not in our national interest.

We have been having a debate in connection with Vietnam on the floor of the Senate for the last several days. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who probably has been as well informed as any other Senator in this body about the cost of the Vietnam war, responded to a question by me just a few weeks ago that the actual cost of the war in Vietnam is running about \$30 billion a year.

Mr. President, that, in itself, is more than 10 times the amount which this Emergency Employment Act asks to be authorized. The remainder of the military budget—Vietnam is less than one-half of it—is still susceptible to being cut by 2 percent, and I think probably more. To my way of thinking, the exclusion of the national defense appropriation from the areas where cuts should be made under the Ribicoff-Percy amendment is unwise and really unfair. I reiterate that this swollen military budget is the one place where I think cuts could easily be made. For that reason alone, I would oppose this amendment.

However, a second reason for opposing the proposal is perhaps best expressed by asking a question: How is the President going to determine what appropriation he is going to cut by 2 percent? He cannot cut in on the national debt which is one of the largest of the items in our budget. Is he going to cut the expenditures for the space program; or will some say, and not without reason, that the space program is directly and primarily related to the national defense? I do not think it is, but imagine the storm which would arise on the floor of the Senate if we abandoned the effort to put a man on the moon in order to pay for the poverty program. Mr. President, I think we should, but to me this is not pragmatically or politically feasible.

Are we going to cut back on the Atomic Energy Commission and its efforts in support of the peaceful development of atomic energy? Imagine what that lobby would say if the President was going to cut 2 percent from that. Are we going to take from health programs and social security programs, or primary, secondary, and higher education programs?

Are we going to take it out of public works? Are we going to take it out of air pollution control? Are we going to take it out of water pollution control?

We would not dare take it out of the highway program, would we? That is a sacred cow. Think of the lobbyists for the highway program who would be storming the ramparts of the Senate if 2 percent were to be taken out of that.

I have great sympathy for the President of the United States in the difficult situation in which he finds himself, but I would not want to make those difficulties almost insuperable by throwing the Ribicoff amendment at him and saying, "Look, Congress passes the buck to you. You decide where these programs shall

be cut. Do not ask us to do our congressional duty by telling you where we want the appropriations cut to pay for the poverty program."

Mr. President, I would hope very much that the OEO Act would survive the debate which has been instituted on the floor of the Senate, but I cannot conscientiously vote for the Ribicoff-Percy amendment. To my way of thinking, it is unfair to the President. It is unrealistic in terms of the way to legislate, to create appropriations for badly needed programs. It is quite wrong in excluding the military budget from the area in which the cut is to be made.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes remain to the Senator from Connecticut and 14 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the argument of my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, particularly to his dire predictions as to what would happen if we cut back on the multitude of programs which he reeled off.

I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for having the foresight to add title II to the poverty bill—a giant step forward in trying to solve the problems of the American cities.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania would not have taken this great step that will cost 2.8 billion if he did not think it was important.

But if we really believe that jobs are the No. 1 priority in America today in the ghettos and cities of America, then we should be willing to say that if we do not have sufficient funds, then we will spend our money on the matters and the programs that are most important.

The distinguished Senator was absent from the Chamber when I pointed out that the Department of Housing and Urban Renewal estimated there are some 250 urban programs. The latest OEO catalog indicates there are 459 programs through which Federal funds flow to various cities, organizations, and individuals.

Basically, if the various committees of Congress have not taken the time to list the priority items among 459 programs, then I believe that we have abdicated our responsibility.

Mr. President, I should like to read for a few moments from an article in the publication "Urban America: Goals and Problems," of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Urban Affairs. The article was written by Roger Starr, who is the executive director of the Citizens Housing and Planning Council of New York. He writes:

One cannot understand the riots without studying the psychological structure of the rioters and their sympathizers, or investigating their family constellations, education, and personal history. Such an investigation might reveal that the riots themselves are

not so much a form of protest as a form of gratification; that they express the extent of the disorganization of some low-income Negro families as well as the economic and social deprivation of the Negro community as a whole. Such an investigation might reveal that this family disorganization is partly the cause of the conditions complained of, and partly an effect of those conditions. From this point of view, the riots become, for those engaged in them, a substitute for the gratifications of work, and the socially acceptable masculine satisfactions of family leadership.

The article also points to the basic need for jobs in establishing the self-respect of the individuals who are rioting, the gratification of having a job, the need of the people for self-respect, so that they will feel they have some meaning in our society.

I, for one, cannot understand the leadership of this august committee, which was willing to face the problem and the need for jobs, and willing to say that they would authorize the expenditure of \$2.8 billion because they thought it was so important, even though we are running a deficit of \$29 billion at the present time; and their current position of being concerned that if an element of priority was introduced, some less important items might be deferred for a year. All these items are important. But the time has come for us not to put all our faith in a programmatic approach, which has failed, but in a systematic approach based on priorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. With all the programs we have voted on, we still have not achieved the objective we sought. The reason is that we have not gone to the root of the basic problem that plagues the ghettos and cities of America.

The No. 1 problem that cries out for priority action is for jobs. The No. 2 priority is housing.

I do not believe that we are studying the problem enough, that we are willing to come up with a solution, when we fear to ask the President to temporarily put aside a worthy project if it does not have the priority of jobs and housing—and in this case we are talking about jobs.

I would hope that since the Congress of the United States is unwilling to vote the funds or to vote the taxes for the No. 1 priority of the cities in America, that at least we would have the good judgment to authorize the President to defer the expenditure of programs that are of less importance in order to vote money for jobs, jobs which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and his committee thought were so important that they were willing to authorize \$2.8 billion of new money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at that point for a question?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not read the entire amendment, but when we talk

about setting aside 2 percent, is that the figure—

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is on the domestic budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Is that 2 percent in any given project, or is it 2 percent of the total?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is 2 percent of the total. The President would be able to make the choice as to whether he would take the 2 percent. He could take more than 2 percent from one project, or nothing from another.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, there would be flexibility there.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would not be what is called 2 percent across the board?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No. It would not be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The total sum allocated would be 2 percent, or a total of \$1.1 billion that would be taken from the overall domestic budget of approximately \$55 billion; is that not correct?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will heed the cogent arguments presented by the Senators from Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and reject the motion, cosponsored by the Senators from Connecticut and Illinois, which would substitute instructions for the instructions in the motion which has been offered by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Illinois. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was resumed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], and the Senator

from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 73, as follows:

[No. 273 Leg.]

YEAS—14

Brewster	Jackson	Proxmire
Case	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Dodd	Magnuson	Smathers
Harris	Morton	Tydings
Hartke	Percy	

NAYS—73

Aiken	Hansen	Mondale
Allott	Hart	Monroney
Anderson	Hatfield	Mundt
Bartlett	Hayden	Murphy
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Nelson
Boggs	Holland	Pearson
Brooke	Hollings	Pell
Burdick	Hruska	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Carlson	Kennedy, Mass.	Sparkman
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Spong
Clark	Kuchel	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Symington
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Dirksen	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dominick	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Fannin	McGee	Yarborough
Fong	McGovern	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Griffin	Metcalf	
Gruening	Miller	

NOT VOTING—13

Baker	Gore	Pastore
Bayh	Inouye	Russell
Cooper	Montoya	Tower
Ellender	Morse	
Ervin	Moss	

So the Ribicoff-Percy amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 371

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I call up amendment No. 371, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 371) of Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

In lieu of the instruction to strike out title II, I move to strike title II and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE II—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT

"SHORT TITLE

"Sec. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Emergency Employment Act of 1967'.

**"PART A—EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE**

"SEC. 202. (a) The Congress finds that certain communities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by severe unemployment and underemployment. Such areas contain large concentrations or proportions of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular competitive employment because of lack of education, occupational skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement. This situation is aggravated by migration of unskilled rural residents to urban areas. Many of the affected areas are doubly handicapped by the lack of sufficient jobs for all the potential labor force. This condition is destructive of human dignity and results in a loss of national productivity. In many localities the problem has reached crisis proportion by contributing to social unrest and civil disorder.

"(b) At the same time there is a huge backlog of need for additional public services and public facilities in such fields as those which (1) contribute to the development of human potential, (2) better the conditions under which people live, learn, and work, and (3) aid in the development and conservation of natural resources.

"(c) Therefore, it is the purpose of this part to provide meaningful employment opportunities in public service and other activities which will relieve severe unemployment in urban and rural areas and contribute to the national interest by fulfilling unmet needs.

"ELIGIBLE AREAS

"SEC. 203. The Secretary of Labor (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall designate urban and rural areas to be eligible for assistance under this part. Such areas shall contain a high concentration or proportion of low-income families and individuals and shall have severe problems of unemployment and underemployment or, with respect to rural areas, problems of out-migration. They may be defined without regard to political boundaries.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to public agencies and private organizations for part or all of the costs of programs which create meaningful public service and other employment opportunities. He shall adopt procedures to assure (1) that there is maximum emphasis on local initiative and responsibility with full participation of and maximum cooperation among local public officials, residents of eligible areas, and representatives of private organizations in the establishment of programs under this part, including, without limitation, the determination of areas and participants eligible for assistance and the selection of projects under subsection (b) of this section, and (2) that such assistance is fully coordinated with programs operated under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and other relevant Federal Acts.

"(b) Jobs created or made available under this part may include services and supporting facilities in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, parks and municipal maintenance, housing and neighborhood improvement, conservation and rural development, beautification, and other fields of human betterment and public improvement. Such jobs shall include (1) those which can be made available immediately to persons who are otherwise unable to obtain employment, (2) those which provide placement resources for persons completing training under titles I and V of the Economic Opportunity Act and other relevant man-

power training programs, and (3) those which use the skills of unemployed persons in areas with a chronic labor surplus. Priority shall be given to projects which are labor intensive in character.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to provide financial assistance to assure that (1) persons employed in jobs created by this part are provided opportunity for further education, training, and necessary supportive services, including those provided by other relevant Acts, so that they may be prepared to obtain regular competitive employment in the future; and (2) that maximum effort is made to encourage private employers to adopt innovative approaches which create additional jobs and new types of careers for low-income and disadvantaged persons.

"LOANS

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make loans to public and private agencies for the purchase of supplies and equipment which support and supplement projects carried out by participants under section 204.

"(b) Loans authorized under this section may be made without interest and under such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 206. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons who reside in eligible areas and who meet other criteria prescribed by the Secretary and priority shall be given to persons who are heads of families. Low income shall be defined in terms of section 125 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"(b) For the purposes of this part, the term 'heads of families' includes any person who contributes more than one-half of the support of one or more other persons.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) wages paid a participant shall not be lower than, whichever is the highest of (A) the minimum wage which would be applicable to the employment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied to the participant and he was not exempt under section 13 thereof, (B) the State or local minimum wage for the most nearly comparable covered employment, or (C) the prevailing rate of wages in the area for similar work.

"(4) the program will, to the extent appropriate, contribute to the occupational development or upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families in urban neighborhoods or rural areas having concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"(d) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible,

contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement, including civil service requirements which restrict employment opportunities for the disadvantaged.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 208. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress made in implementing this part and suggestions for improvements on or before May 15, 1968, November 15, 1968, and on or before May 15 and November 15 of each year thereafter.

**"PART B—HUMAN INVESTMENT JOB
TRAINING**

"SEC. 210. This part may be cited as the Human Investment Act of 1967.

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 211. The purpose of this part is to provide incentives to private employers other than nonprofit organizations to invest in the improvement of the Nation's human resources by hiring, training, and employing persons eligible to participate in programs as provided in section 206 of this title.

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 212. For purposes of this part, the term "employer" means any private person, corporation, firm, or business concern which employs more than ten individuals in a trade or business.

"FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 213. In order to carry out the provisions of this part, the Secretary of Labor is authorized:

"(a) To provide financial assistance to employers for training and employment costs incurred pursuant to a plan approved by the Secretary of Labor under section 214, including, but not limited to—

"(1) unusual training and other unusual services for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive, including, on-the-job counseling, day care and other supportive services;

"(2) all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income persons;

"(3) payments to permit employers to provide employees resident in such areas with transportation to and from work or to reimburse such employees for such transportation; and

"(4) unusual overhead costs incurred as a result of an employee's lack of education, training, or experience, such as costs of spoilage of work or of added managerial effort.

"(b) To prescribe regulations to—

"(1) establish criteria to achieve an equitable distribution among the States of payments made from funds reserved under this Act; but not more than 12.5 per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal year shall be used within any one State;

"(2) provide such application, reporting, and accounting procedures as he deems necessary;

"(3) provide for an evaluation of the program authorized by this subsection in achieving the objectives of this part;

"(4) safeguard against abuses of any incentives provided under this part, including, but not limited to, safeguards against the use of such incentives in order to transfer any enterprise from one area to another and safeguards designed to prevent such incentives from being used as a subsidy for normal operations; and

"(5) assure compliance with the requirements of section 207(a) of this title.

"TRAINING PLAN

"SEC. 214. No financial assistance shall be provided under this part except upon approval by the Secretary of a plan submitted by an employer which shall be revised from time to time as requested by the Secretary, the provisions of which shall include:

"(a) The title and description of the job objectives for which individuals are to be trained;

"(b) The length of the training period;

"(c) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing, for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(d) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course or training, at each successive step in the course and at the completion of training;

"(e) The entrance wage or salary paid to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the individuals are to be trained;

"(f) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required; and

"(g) Information respecting the cost of usual training and other usual services provided employees other than those described in section 206 of this title, in order to make them fully productive.

"SEC. 215. For purposes of applying chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, any grant received by an employer under this part—

"(a) shall not be included in the gross income of such employer, and

"(b) shall not be treated as reimbursement for expenses incurred by such employer in his trade or business.

"PART C—AUTHORIZATIONS, DURATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 221. The Secretary shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year.

"SEC. 222. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, except the provisions of section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$875,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(b) Of the funds authorized under subsection (a) of this section, not less than 10 per centum nor more than 20 per centum shall be used by the Secretary for the purpose of carrying out training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 for persons eligible under section 206 of this title.

"(c) Of the funds appropriated under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall reserve not less than 12.5 per centum nor more than 37.5 per centum for the purpose of carrying out part B of this title.

"(d) For the purpose of making loans under section 205, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

"(e) Appropriations authorized by this section shall remain available until expended."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as well as with the proponent of the pending amendment, the manager of the bill, and others, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, October 4, after the approval of the Journal there be a quorum call to ascertain the presence of a quorum, immediately after which further debate on the motion by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty) (amendment No. 371)

to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) to recommit with instructions S. 2388, a bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, be limited to 20 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, just to make it clear, Senators have unlimited time today and tonight, as long as they wish to remain in session, to debate this amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; the limitation does not begin until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader at what time he intends to have the Senate convene tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Ten o'clock. We already have an order.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether amendments to the Prouty amendment would be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not if the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

VIETNAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on yesterday we had very considerable discussion of the situation in Vietnam, and I think it ranged into the question of the conduct of that struggle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest that the Chamber be cleared and that there be order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chamber will be cleared, and we will have order. All attachés whose presence is not needed in the Chamber will remove themselves from the Chamber.

The Sergeant at Arms is directed to see that these instructions to clear the Chamber are carried out.

The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from time to time inquiry has been made of me about what seems like dissident views that have been expressed on this question of Vietnam, and particularly as it relates to the minority side of the aisle.

I have stated over and over again that the Republican Party umbrella is ample for all purposes and for all shades of opinion. I have only two concerns. The first is, of course, that we do not try to invade the constitutional prerogative of the President of the United States.

The first article of the Constitution does give to the Congress the power of the purse. And, in exercise of that power, we can discipline virtually everything in Government.

The Congress also is the exclusive law-making body in our form of government, and we can abolish every bureau. We can abolish nearly every agency. We cannot abolish the Presidency or the Supreme Court because they are constitutional offices. However, with those exceptions, we can go pretty far in exercising our exclusive function as the one and only lawmaking body. The fact that a whole body of administrative law has developed in this country was only possible under a delegation of power by Congress.

So, we have the power of the purse, and when the Constitution made the President the Commander in Chief, it tendered to him the sword of the country. And that includes not only the conduct of our foreign relations, but also the conduct of any struggle or hostility in which we might be engaged.

The only other concern I have is about my own conduct in this matter. I want to be sure it is in conformity with my conscience and my conviction. Beyond that, it does not make any difference, because my responsibility is to explore for the facts, to ascertain as much as I can on a given subject, and then to exercise an independent judgment.

Mr. President, I hope I have not failed to do that, for Edmond Burke once remarked in Parliament that he felt he would betray his constituency if he did not do that. I grant the same privilege, the same prerogative, and the same latitude of every Member of the Senate.

What is more, I have no hostility toward criticism. I think it was in World War I that Woodrow Wilson said that in time of war we need more criticism, not less. But always it has to be within the framework of our constitutional power, and we must not arrogate to ourselves the conduct of an external struggle.

I think we have had some lessons in that field. Mr. President, the very Capitol, where we sit in the Senate wing, was destroyed in the War of 1812 because there was too much civil interference with the conduct of that war.

Lincoln did not brook any interference from a committee that was set up on the conduct of the war. I think it was General Grant who said that the greatest aid for him was from none other than Jefferson Davis, the President of the Confederacy, because he was interfering with Robert E. Lee and his tactics and his strategy.

Who shall say what the outcome of that war would have been if that great general from the South had been let alone? Nobody knows, but that interference was helpful, and Grant recognized it and paid testimony to it.

So, I grant that right, but I hope always it will be within due bounds. However, criticism, I always recognize.

On Sunday I had an experience and at first, I did not know how it came about. The operator of a very splendid motel in Galesburg, Ill., called me on the telephone. I scarcely know him. He said that he and the city—having a population of about 40,000—were going to be hosts to about 130 or 140 Vietnam veterans, all wounded, who were in the hospital at Great Lakes, Ill.

The whole community was energized to turn out for these youngsters. They lodged them. They fed them. They entertained them. They brought them from Great Lakes to Galesburg, a distance of 150 miles, and they took them back.

I was asked to get on the telephone at 5 o'clock on Sunday and to make them a telephone speech, which I did.

When the speech was over, a sergeant by the name of Wright was designated to respond to the speech, and he did.

He said:

Senator, we want to thank you. You are in our corner, and you have stood up for us, and you stood up for the cause. And we, the wounded from Vietnam, want you to know it from us. And we say it as sincerely, as simply, as emphatically as we know how. We simply thank you.

What I did first on Sunday was to salute them as a measure of deference, because a salute is given to a superior, and I recognize the superiority of their sacrifice. They come back without legs and without arms. And if anybody wants to see what Vietnam has done, he needs only to go out to Walter Reed, which is an evacuation hospital, to see the results.

When flowers came into my room at the hospital from time to time, I got a cart and went down to the Vietnam wards with those bouquets. They were better for them than for me. However, I have seen what has happened, and I yield to nobody in my hope, in my desire, and in my prayers that somehow this insane and grim and grisly business can honorably come to an end.

I think you have to say that for the President of the United States. I cannot in my position, and I cannot under any circumstances, denigrate him or demean him in the eyes of the world in connection with this controversy by anything that I might say. And so, granting all this latitude to anybody in the legislative branch of the Government, I feel that the time has come to say a little more than I have said on the subject of Vietnam.

I recognize my kinship with those who were out in Galesburg, Ill., by virtue of a common uniform which I wore 50 years ago as a private first class, as a sergeant, and as a second lieutenant in France on the western front. That is a kinship that you cannot forget.

And I want to be sure that almost a half million American boys who are out there in the cause of our country will not be the forgotten men under any circumstances, because they are too precious as Americans who have responded and are willing to do their duty even if the last and supreme sacrifice is required for their services.

I will never forget as I think of the thousands who have now died, in addition to the thousands who have been wounded, the lines of Colonel McCrae, that Canadian doctor who had a field dressing station on the banks of the Ypres River in France, and saw the bodies roll down into the door of his dressing room tent out there on the front, and who finally committed his soul to paper and in that tender and gentle poem said:

We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Well, some boys are lying out there. I do not know what I would say to the shades of those who made that sacrifice. I want to be sure, if I can, that it is not a vanity and that I fully recognize my responsibility in an anxious hour like this.

It was said the other day:

First. That our programs and our policies were suspect by friend and foe alike. Where, I would like to know? Who besides Bonnie Charles de Gaulle has been so bold as to affront us in this field? Thirty countries are helping us now. Have you heard it from Australia? Have you heard it from New Zealand? Have you heard it from Korea? Indeed, not. The nations have been there in our corner. They did not always send troops, but there were other kinds of assistance that they sent.

So, is that a good sentiment to utter, that we are suspect by friend and foe alike? I do not know where it is, and I want to see the proof. And I do not like to see it go on the dispatch wires into every corner of the earth, to make a headline.

I remember once doing some work on immigration, trying to help India; and when I got to Bombay and Calcutta, the headlines were that high—"India's Friend Is Here."

Nothing is provincial here, or parochial; nothing is limited. What we say here goes on the wire. And if you want a lesson, send somewhere—I could tell you where—to get the international shortwave monitor, and see what is said on the Senate floor, which goes out of the shortwave stations from Peking and from Hanoi and elsewhere.

How good is it for the morale of the troops? You ought to be out there on the front on a lonely night, when the bombs are dropping or the mortar shells are coming over, and see whether it makes a difference. Oh, yes, they begin to wonder whether they are the forgotten men, and are forgotten back home. It is a ghastly feeling, I can tell you; and sometimes I had it on the western front a long, long time ago. That is one thing about which I want to be extremely careful.

It has been said that the President was brainwashed by a military-industrial complex. I would hate to have heard that said about General Eisenhower, the grand captain of the second great crusade mission in world affairs. I do not believe anybody ever said it about him, great tactician that he was, great strategist that he was. They combed the Army to find him. And General Marshall was deeply attached to him. And so he became the grand captain.

Well, I can imagine how he feels about a statement like that. It does not sound good and it does not look good, because he was a Republican President who served us with honor and distinction. And it would not sound good about any President.

Have you heard the British demean their King and Queen? If you have, show

me the day and the time. Why, we were so circumspect about it that when the King and Queen were our guests, we set up a scaffolding in that rotunda so that the cameras would not catch the surrender of Burgoyne at Saratoga and the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. That is how circumspect we were. And I was there, roving around in the place, to find out what it was all about.

No, you do not demean the ruler. The President is not our ruler, but you do not demean him in the eyes of people abroad; for when you do, you demean the prestige of this Republic. And I do not mean to do it, as the one remaining great, free republic on the face of the earth.

Yesterday, this whole question about security came up. Where was our security? I heard the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee ask these questions. I am no tactician, goodness knows. I have been to the command staff school as a lieutenant, but I am no tactician, I am no strategist. But I do know this, Mr. President, from those with whom I have associated in government: that our outer defense perimeter started in Korea and went to South Vietnam. Now, you see, Saigon, in South Vietnam, is at the lower end. That is our left flank. Suppose the left flank of your line is turned and you lose Vietnam? Then what?

The distinguished Senator from Hawaii can certainly tell us about how close it is from the Philippines to Malaysia and to Indonesia. And you cite to me a holding station where you can hold if we lose Vietnam. There is no place short of Singapore. Anybody who has some perspective knowledge of tactics can tell you that. And when you are in Singapore, you are at one of the clogged water courses that I am confident, as surely as I am standing here, the Soviets are going to try to control. Control Panama, control Singapore, the two ends of the Gulf of Aden and Suez, and you have just about command of the world. That is all you need.

So you have to see this in perspective. There is no holding line between Saigon and Singapore. So when they speak about the fall of Southeast Asia, they are not kidding. And I am not disposed to quarrel with men who have gone through our military schools, who have worked with worldwide maps, and who are expected to plot this thing in the large. That is what you need for the security of the country.

There may be Members in this body this afternoon who may remember, as I remember, when during the war we went down to the Munitions Building for briefings by George Marshall, the Chief of Staff.

I almost fell out of my seat one morning. These were members of the Appropriations Committee. I almost fell out of my seat when suddenly, out of a clear sky, he said:

Gentlemen, I may have bad news for you.

We waited with bated breath. He said:

Our best intelligence tells us that the Japanese are going to invade Alaska, and for the moment we can't stop them. We can't redeploy our troops from the Pacific. We think the strategy we follow is correct; and

gram can be continued to the completion of a Degree of Associate in Industrial Management and, in addition, credits earned in the physical sciences may be applied to a Bachelor of Science degree. Programs leading to the degrees of Master of Science in fluid power engineering and in engineering management are also offered.

Here in Wisconsin are trained and educated the men and women of key responsibility in the running of the machinery of the world.

Have you taken the time recently to examine and evaluate your own individual, and corporate, continuing education needs?

During this period Karl Werwath achieved, among many other awards, the distinction of being the only member of the American Society For Engineering Education to receive both the James H. McGraw Award for Outstanding Contribution to Development of Technical Institution Education and the Arthur L. Williston Award for the Publication of Literature on Technical Institution Education.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last week the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] moved to strike title II from the pending bill, S. 2388, the 1967 amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, and later offered a motion which would have the effect of recommitting the bill to the Labor and Public Welfare Committee with instructions to strike title II.

The amendment which I have offered, Mr. President, will, if adopted, change the instructions in the motion to recommit. It removes the requirement that title II be stricken.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the effect of this amendment, if adopted, would be to change the instructions of the motion to recommit. It removes the requirement that title II be stricken. Instead, the amendment instructs the Labor and Public Welfare Committee to report back the bill, S. 2388, forthwith with the following changes in title II.

First. Instead of a 2-year program totaling \$2.8 billion, the authorization would be limited to \$875 million until expended.

Second. A provision would be added which would have the effect of giving priority for jobs under all parts of title II, to eligible persons who are heads of families. By heads of families, we mean a person who contributes more than one-half the support of one or more other persons.

Third. A provision would be added which would earmark not less than 10 percent nor more than 20 percent of the \$875 million authorization to be used by the Secretary of Labor for the purpose of expanding the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962.

Finally, a provision for reserving from \$100 to \$300 million for use by the Secretary of Labor as incentive for private industry to engage in job training programs would be included. The Secretary would be authorized to make grants to private industry for employee training expenses of an employer.

Mr. President, I shall discuss each of these provisions in some detail and then explain, why with these changes, title II of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 is acceptable to me.

Under the provisions of my amendment, the authorization for the Emergency Employment Act of title II would only be for 1 year. The total authorization for 1 year has been cut by \$500 million. I have not suggested a greater reduction because the need for jobs and job training is pressing and grave. The expense, although great, is justifiable because by training and retraining men, we are investing in their future productivity and contributing to the wealth of the Nation. By creating jobs for those who cannot be trained, we are enabling people to have self-respect and to at least earn a living rather and merely receive welfare.

However, Mr. President, this is a large program involving a great deal of money. Rather than to authorize it for 2 years, I think it might be worthwhile to reevaluate effects of the various parts in 1 year's time and perhaps make some changes in programs before expending additional funds.

One of the objections I have had to the programs already created under the Economic Opportunity Act is that they have not been properly examined, and once established, we have been reluctant to cut them back much less to eradicate them. Let us not make the same mistake with the Goliath of an employment act. By authorizing expenditures for 1 year, we commit ourselves to an examination and reevaluation next year. We retain flexibility.

Mr. President, it has been estimated that some 3 million able-bodied Americans are for the most part unemployed. In addition, there are some 5 million Americans who work for less than the minimum wage.

The cost of providing merely the 3 million with jobs at the minimum wage has been estimated at \$12 billion annually. Obviously at this juncture we are not able to expend such a vast sum of money. But who is to decide which of

these people is to receive either job training or public service jobs to the exclusion of the others?

I suggest, Mr. President, in view of the limited authorization that priority be given to one particular group of Americans; namely, the head of the family.

Garth L. Mangum, in a paper entitled "Government as Employer of Last Resort," presents some excellent reasons for giving priority to heads of families. He states that there need to be more programs offering job opportunities for youths under 20, but notes that out-of-school, out-of-work youths are not often always attracted by minimum wage make-work jobs or motivated to retrain in them. Basic education and training are far more important for them. He goes on to say:

A little over one half of the long-term unemployed men and one-fourth of the long-term unemployed women in 1966 were married family heads. So were 60 per cent of the out of the labor force males and half of the involuntary part-time workers. Limiting the employment guarantee to family heads would therefore be a defensible initial approach.

Family heads, Mangum presumes, would be more motivated to remain in jobs, especially if training were provided.

By giving priority to family heads, we provide the out-of-work fathers or mothers with children an opportunity to regain both self-sufficiency and self-esteem. In this way, a better family environment can be encouraged which will have a beneficial effect on the children who will be tomorrow's providers. The concept of the family is basic to our society and whatever we can do to uphold the integrity of that institution will contribute to the well being of all of our citizens and our Nation. There is increasing evidence that a broken home is detrimental to children. It inhibits the learning process and perhaps contributes to juvenile delinquency.

Thus, by giving priority to heads of families, the older generation is directly benefited and the younger generation receives indirect benefits.

Mr. President, the second section of my proposed amendment which I would like to discuss in part C, authorization for Manpower Development and Training Act. In essence, this section requires that not less than 10 percent or more than 20 percent of the funds authorized for title II must be used through the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

I have earmarked this proportion of the funds for Manpower Development and Training Act, Mr. President, for several reasons. First, I believe that it is the most effective training program in existence today. Second, it can easily, and, in fact, needs to be expanded. Finally, it can be incorporated into the type of comprehensive manpower and training approach which I have been advocating.

The Manpower Development and Training Act has been widely acclaimed because of its flexibility and because of its achievements. Secretary Willard Wirtz, speaking at hearings before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee's Subcommittee on Employment and

Manpower in 1965, cited the "basic soundness of training programs under Manpower Development and Training Act" and recommended that the act be put on a more permanent basis. He said:

The effectiveness of an active manpower policy as carried out under the MDTA is now clear from the record of proven experience. There is no doubt that the training and retraining of unemployed workers is a sound social and financial investment.

In 1966, Congress enacted substantial amendments, demonstrating that Manpower Development and Training Act was a "living, changing law" with "flexibility and capacity to adapt quickly to changing needs." The amendments substantially changed Manpower Development and Training Act to make it more effective an instrument for combating unemployment among the poor.

The Manpower Development and Training Act was redirected in 1966 toward the poor, by specifying that 65 percent of the training effort would be "person-oriented" or directed toward the reclamation of hardcore unemployed. The groups which were to receive the greatest attention were enumerated. They included: "culturally impoverished and poorly educated youth, the unemployed of middle age or older, minority groups, persons with low educational attainment, the long-term unemployed, and the rural poor."

Further, in 1966, the on-the-job training component of Manpower Development and Training Act was expanded. In fiscal year 1967, the on-the-job training program will constitute 50 percent of all Manpower Development and Training Act training. This is a vast increase from 1963, when the on-the-job training portion of Manpower Development and Training Act was only 6 percent. In addition, participation by private industry has increased. In 1963 only 400 businesses were involved, while today over 2,000 are involved.

VALUE OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

The amended act has been highly praised. Sar Levitan in a paper entitled, "Alternative Approaches to Manpower Policies," states:

During its five years of operation, MDTA has demonstrated its effectiveness. Available studies, though limited, indicate that benefits exceed costs; and the program has proven adaptable to changing policy goals and labor market conditions.

Stephen Kurzman, in a paper entitled "Private Enterprise Participation in the Antipoverty Program" concludes that:

On-The-Job Training stimulated by the cost reimbursement treatment method under the MDT Act appears to be a highly effective tool for training and placing the unemployed and under-employed in satisfying jobs.

Available statistics substantiate the fact that both institutional and on-the-job training components are relatively successful in placing graduates in jobs. Institutional trainees averaged 73.6 percent initial placement over the first 3 years and on-the-job training averaged 93.1 percent initial placement. Both of these figures contrast favorably with 50

percent of all those public assistance recipients who entered work training and experience programs only to return to welfare roles upon completion of the program.

Prof. Garth Mangum, in an interview recently, stated that a much higher percentage of Manpower Development and Training Act enrollees than he had thought were actually extremely disadvantaged. He declared he had evidence that one-half of the family heads in Manpower Development and Training Act had incomes of less than \$3,000 a year when they entered the program.

Manpower Development and Training Act has been very successful in both meeting particular skill shortages and in establishing skill ladders. It has alleviated skill shortages in jobs which require less than 2 years of training and has made significant contributions in the fields of machine operators, welders, motor vehicle mechanics, and body repairmen, secretaries, and draftsmen.

The on-the-job training part of Manpower Development and Training Act has been particularly successful in meeting skill shortages. The President's manpower report to Congress describes one such example:

The OJT program in the tool and die industry is an outstanding example of this industry-Government approach to a skill shortage situation. Since early 1964, a project sponsored by the Department of Labor and conducted by the National Tool, Die, and Precision Machining Association has provided opportunities for preapprenticeship or apprenticeship entry training for unemployed persons as tool and die makers and machinists. The project was so successful that in March 1966 the Department extended it to provide training for 1800 workers, bringing the total number of trainees under the project to nearly 3000.

The same report gives two examples of programs which are particularly successful in upgrading the skills of workers, many of whom are disadvantaged:

For example, under a national agreement with the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, 1,000 journeymen are to be given training which will upgrade their skills, and 2,000 unemployed men are to be trained as carpenter apprentices. About half the trainees will receive preapprenticeship training in a coupled project and the other half will enter apprenticeship directly. The employers will receive on-the-job training assistance for 26 weeks of the four-year apprenticeship term.

The same pattern is seen in a major pilot project, launched early in 1967 in New York City, to upgrade the skills of 2,500 employed workers. The four major unions and industrial leaders involved are committed to filling the vacated less skilled jobs with entry workers drawn from minority groups and the ranks of disadvantaged and long-term unemployed.

Because of the facts which I have cited, Mr. President, I think it is fair to conclude that the Manpower Development and Training Act has been an effective and highly successful program. Obviously, it would be advantageous to expand such a program. However, we must first consider whether or not the Manpower Development and Training Act program can easily be expanded to the degree to which I recommend.

I believe that it can be expanded. Stephen Kurzman, in his report which I quoted earlier, stated:

The present level of the on-the-job training program is . . . both highly fortuitous and considerably lower than its apparent potential.

A noted authority in the job training field who has been intensively studying the Manpower Development and Training Act around the country, continually asked the question: "Given your present capacity, how much could you expand the Manpower Development and Training Act immediately?" He reported that he never was given any figure less than double, saying:

They have people who are available in general to go into the program and they have the capability in general to expand it very rapidly. But nobody has made that kind of proposal for MDTA.

I am making that kind of proposal, Mr. President.

I have indicated that the Manpower Development and Training Act has been successful, and I have quoted several authorities who believe that the Manpower Development and Training Act can and should be expanded. These facts alone justify my inclusion of 10 percent to 20 percent delegation of title II funds to Manpower Development and Training Act. However, there is still another reason why it is important to expand this program.

Last week, when I addressed the Senate, I spoke of the desperate need for a coordinated, comprehensive approach to the problems of poverty. I indicated that this kind of approach was particularly imperative with regard to unemployment and underemployment problems in order to alleviate the resent piecemeal efforts.

In order to be truly comprehensive, a job training program must treat the multiple ills of the disadvantaged unemployed or underemployed person. The Manpower Development and Training Act, with the enactment of the 1966 amendments began to supply supportive services—namely, medical services to enrollees. Increased attention has been given to the necessity for reclaiming individuals as well as merely training them. The President's manpower report to Congress notes that—

With the funds available, the target set for fiscal year 1965 was training for 250,000 individuals—a reduction from the 275,000 total for the previous year, since it was recognized that the new emphasis on the disadvantaged would require more intensive effort with many individual trainees. Training emphasis was to be equally divided between institutional and on-the-job training, and special attention was to be given to enlisting greater assistance from industry in training for upgrading and in providing opportunity for the disadvantaged.

It was recognized that no sharp dividing line could in fact be drawn between the two aspects of the training program—human reclamation and the remedy of skill shortages.

I have noted time and time again, Mr. President, that there is much duplicity and overlap in job training programs. I believe, however, that if the best programs can be expanded, some of the in-

effectual ones can be phased out. Then perhaps we can coordinate the remaining ones. Sar Levitan, in "Poverty and Human Resources Abstract" of September-October 1966 decries this lack of integration:

The fragmentation of federally supported training programs assumes crucial significance when the impact upon clientele is considered....

The defects of the present system have become particularly pronounced as labor shortages develop in an increasing number of communities and occupations. In a looser labor market, when jobs are scarcer, a training program may become a holding operation. But in the present labor market, as the demand for labor intensifies, the training programs should become an integral part of labor supply, as activities of the training programs are increasingly a concern of broader sections of the population.

An increased emphasis on Manpower Development and Training Act and its endorsement and inclusion in the Economic Opportunity Act could perhaps be a step in the integration process.

Finally, Mr. President, I have stated time and time again that the poverty war cannot be won by the efforts of the Government alone. The involvement and participation of all segments of the community must be sought. On-the-job training in particular encourages the participation of private industry. An expanded Manpower Development and Training Act program along with the enactment of the human investment provisions of my amendment could achieve this to a large degree. The combination of these two approaches has been recommended by many, including the President's manpower report, which stated:

Various methods or combinations of methods of Government financial assistance for privately administered training programs have been proposed. MDTA on-the-job training, for example, provides one form of current assistance which has been highly successful, although on a limited scale. Large-scale expansion of this program might constitute one approach to the problem. Other suggested approaches would involve incentives such as special taxes coupled with tax credits for business expenditures in connection with on-the-job training programs.

Mr. President, only 290,000 of the 3 million Americans who are unemployed are currently being reached by Federal manpower and training programs. Obviously, this is insufficient performance if we really want to win the war against poverty.

I submit, Mr. President, that the primary reason for this insufficient performance is that we have failed to significantly involve the private sector of our economy. Secretary of Labor Wirtz, in a statement submitted to our committee, acknowledged this deficiency when he said:

The most underdeveloped aspect of the manpower program (and possibly the poverty program as well) involves the potential for increased private participation.

In April of this year the manpower report of the President also recognized this difficulty when it stated:

If the enormous occupational training task which will face the Nation during the next several years is to be successfully accomplished, greater Government-industry effort in the area of skills training will be required.

Basic issues should be jointly examined—such as the better coordination and division of training responsibility between private industry, Government, and the educational system; the need for broad planning and coordination of the Nation's total training effort; and the possibility and desirability of financial assistance to employers to help them continue to carry the largest share of the training burden.

But, Mr. President, a mere recognition of the fact that greater Government-industry effort is needed is not enough. Our poor performance in the area of skills training points up the need for substantially greater participation by industry. We in Congress must enact legislation which will stimulate private industry to increase job training for unemployed or low income Americans.

It was with this need in mind that I, together with 120 other Republicans, sponsored the Human Investment Act. Unfortunately, legislative action on the Human Investment Act has been delayed primarily because of its provision for a general tax credit incentive. Apparently the tax credit is alien to the philosophy which presupposes the need for direct Federal control over all Government-subsidized manpower training programs.

Since I believe the need for a substantially increased effort in manpower training is now acute, I have made an effort in this amendment to set aside philosophical disagreements over the tax credit approach. Consequently, I have modified the human investment approach to remove the tax credit feature.

Even with this modification, I believe the human investment approach represents a major step forward. It offers possibilities for widespread involvement by private industry.

Primarily, Mr. President, the human investment approach is based on the premise that job training under the direct auspices of private industry is generally preferable to institutional training conducted by Government. There are a number of reasons why I believe this premise is sound.

First, job training by private industry minimizes the necessity for Government intervention and regulation in the economy. The Government does not need to get into the business of screening instructors, determining curriculum, supporting trainees, and other such appendages of Government-run programs, beyond the point of assuring that useful training is, in fact, being imparted by the employer.

Federal-State complications, elaborate placement procedures, and general administrative problems are largely avoided. It is interesting in this connection to note that the British Government, faced with the identical problem in 1963, chose to promote job training through private industry instead of setting up an elaborate Government-operated program.

Second, the great majority of those trained by private business are actually employees on the payroll. A number of studies, notably that by Prof. Richard Cloward of Columbia University's School of Social Work, reported in the January 1965 issue of *American Child*, have shown that the motivation of an unskilled and unemployed person to com-

plete a training program bears a different relation to his perceived chance for obtaining employment promptly at the conclusion of his training.

Much of the dropout problem in such institutional programs as the Job Corps and the Manpower Development and Training Act are traceable to a sense of discouragement and uncertainty felt by the trainee with respect to his job chances after training. When the trainee has been positively assured that he will be hired for a given job if he satisfactorily completes the training, the chances that he will abandon the program decrease drastically.

One of the most pitiful spectacles to me, Mr. President, is the spectacle of a man who has completed a Manpower Development and Training Act institutional program, only to find that there are no job openings for him in his area. When private firms are responsible for the training, however, the trainee is almost invariably either hired at the beginning or given a firm promise of employment when his training is complete. This point has been driven home ably by Mr. M. S. Hutcheson, general president of the Carpenter's Union, in his editorial in the February 1966 issue of the *Carpenter*. Mr. Hutchinson writes:

A realistic approach to training programs ought to be a fundamental part of the governments attitude toward eliminating poverty. Any program undertaken ought to be based on a reasonable assumption that there will be a place for a youngster when he has completed his training. Any other approach is neither fair to the youngster, to the industry, or to the nation.

I believe it is indisputably true that private industry people, far more than the Government or institutional personnel, know where and what the jobs will be.

Third, when private industry trains a man it invests in him. That investment is made with the expectation that the trainee can contribute to the company's productivity as an employee following training—else it would be difficult to justify the expense to the stockholder. Thus there is a built-in bias in favor of the employer giving top quality training, carefully designed to prepare the trainee for a position for which a worker is needed.

It would make little sense for a firm to train men and women as a public service project, and then see its investment wasted because the company has no appropriate job openings. Speaking on this point, Prof. William Faunce of the Labor and Industrial Relations Center of Michigan State University has said:

A retraining program which did not involve retraining with respect to specific job openings is not a meaningful retraining program.

Here training by private industry has a great advantage over solely Government-run programs.

Fourth, the instructors in on-the-job training programs are directly involved in the latest day-to-day developments in the field. Unlike instructors in schools, they are in the forefront of innovation and technological change, and thus can

give, by and large, more up-to-date instruction to trainees.

Fifth, private industry can train workers on the latest models of machines without necessarily investing in new equipment for the purpose. Faced by the rapid pace of innovation in many training fields, schools too often are left with the choice between trying to train people on obsolete equipment or obtaining new equipment, with a resulting increase in the cost of the training program. This fact accounts for a large part of the cost savings that can be realized by utilizing the resources of private industry for job training.

Sixth, by training the trainee in the context of an actual job situation, private industry provides a more realistic preparation for continued employment. The trainee is spared the problem of making what may be a difficult adjustment from a simulated to an actual work-site. To many trainees at the bottom end of the ladder, the prospect of regular employment with a company is a strange and bewildering experience. To have to adjust to this situation at the moment of maximum subconscious anxiety—just when training in an institutional program has been completed—puts an additional psychological burden on the worker, which may be reflected in poor performance.

This factor does not apply, of course, in the case of longtime workers who are merely changing from one line of employment to another via retraining. In the case of a hard-core unemployed person, however, it merits consideration.

Seventh, on-the-job training has conclusively proven to be more economical than the equivalent institutional training. Experience of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training in comparing per hour costs of trainees in institutional and in on-the-job training programs shows that where the average cost of the former runs over \$5 per hour, the latter cost the taxpayer only 55 cents per hour. Even when the wage of the trainee, paid by the employer, is added on, it is still obvious that the on-the-job programs are more than twice as economical as the school programs.

Indeed, Labor Secretary Wirtz, in reply to my question submitted at a Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee hearing last February, stated:

There is considerable economy in on the job training over institutional training. The average cost per trainee in on the job training is approximately one third that of the average total cost of institutional training.

At the same time he presented new figures from calendar year 1965 experience, showing the average cost to the taxpayer of on-the-job training programs to be \$26 per week per trainee, while the cost of institutional training ran about \$60 per week per trainee. Even though the two types of training are not directly comparable without some qualification, it is still clear that from a taxpayer's point of view, training on the job means money saved.

Eighth, on-the-job training is adaptable to any size training class and to any location, urban or rural. Institutional classes are limited to minimum numbers which may not exceed the required num-

ber of workers in a given occupation. Institutional facilities are not often available at all in rural areas; private business, however, can design programs for even one trainee—small firms with one apprentice in training are not uncommon. In fact, as of spring 1962, more than half of the apprentices surveyed in a national survey conducted by the Labor Department were employed in establishments with fewer than 100 workers.

Industry, as well as unemployed and low income persons, would greatly benefit from the human investment approach. My amendment would provide an incentive to private industry for improving its manpower efficiency and to fulfill its social obligations.

Many businessmen are faced with employee inefficiencies because they cannot afford the total cost of adequate job training or retraining. This amendment would provide enough incentive for many businessmen to intensify training programs thus increasing business efficiency.

Equally important, severe manpower shortages plaguing many parts of the country could be eased. New York State, for one, has suffered severely from skill shortages. According to the New York Times of January 8, 1967, State Senate Majority Leader Earl W. Bridges reported alarming shortages of skilled personnel in a number of areas, including skilled and semiskilled trades. In doing so he announced the formation of a special ad hoc committee of the State Senate to survey the manpower problem and recommend means for its solution.

LABOR SHORTAGE NOW

Sylvia Porter, the well-known financial columnist, reports in her column of January 12, 1967, in Burlington, Vt., Free Press:

So severe are some skill shortages, in fact, that corporations, schools and government agencies are now raiding each other to fill job openings, paying bonuses of up to \$300 to employees who can deliver new job recruits, scouring Canada and Europe for employees.

Miss Porter concludes:

The basic, long term answer to skill shortages can only be drastically improved and increased vocational education and job training by private industry as well as by government agencies.

Industry could not only prosper economically from this amendment, but also better fulfill its social obligations. In recent months we have all sensed a willingness by many businessmen to become involved in the war on poverty. In Rochester, N.Y., for example, I understand businessmen have agreed to provide jobs for over 2,000 unemployed. These businesses have carried out obligations to society without subsidies or monetary incentives. However, realistically we cannot expect all businesses to follow the lead of the Rochester businessmen without some incentive. I believe this amendment would encourage substantially increased participation in the war on poverty by businessmen throughout the country.

The human investment approach, Mr. President, would benefit unemployed or low-income individuals. It would also benefit industry. And finally, Mr. President, it would benefit the Federal Gov-

ernment by relieving some of the burdens of the war on poverty.

Mr. President, I have just described the four significant changes in the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 that my amendment would make. I believe that I have demonstrated the desirability of limiting the authorization to 1 year, gearing the program to heads of families, utilizing the excellent experience we have had under the Manpower Development and Training Act, and initiating a human investment approach as an incentive for greater participation by private industry.

Now, Mr. President, I imagine that many are wondering what has prompted me to change my mind concerning the enactment of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967. On this floor last week I noted that the title II program was reminiscent of New Deal days and only a make-work program which did not represent a long-range solution to unemployment problems.

Even though I had doubts concerning the advisability of enacting title II as originally proposed, I was aware that large segments of the American population desperately need assistance. I realize, Mr. President, that the number unemployed and looking for work in the United States has averaged nearly 3 million during the first half of 1967. I realize, Mr. President, that to reduce unemployment to a rate of 3 percent would take 600,000 new jobs. I realize, Mr. President, that meeting unemployment with jobs is central to solving the crisis of our cities and rural areas.

While these statistics, Mr. President, demand constructive action during this session of Congress, I could not see instituting a \$2.8 billion work relief program for a 2-year period.

After taking a hard look at the provisions of title II, I am convinced that if my amendments to it are adopted it could have a beneficial impact on our Nation.

First of all, Mr. President, it would get down to the serious work of training thousands of unemployed persons to become productive members of our society. In years to come, taxes from these individuals alone would more than pay for the Emergency Employment Act of 1967.

Second, Mr. President, it would provide industry with a real incentive to become a fullfledged partner with Government in this war on poverty. As I have pointed out so many times on this floor, the Federal Government alone cannot do the job of eliminating poverty. There must be a coordinated and comprehensive effort by the Federal, State and local governments, and above all both the private sector of the economy and organized labor must become fully involved.

Third, Mr. President, I fully realize that there are some unemployed persons who would not respond to job training in any way, shape or form. What do we do with this type of individual, Mr. President? Do we give him relief checks and let him sit on his front porch playing cribbage and drinking beer? Do we forget about him and let him become a

beggar? Do we ignore him and hope that some way he will disappear?

Realistically, Mr. President, I think that we have to realize that for some individuals the Government must become the employer of last resort. I know, Mr. President, that considering the Government as the employer of last resort conjures up the image of the "shovel leaning" WPA worker of the 30's. I am sure that part of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 would generate a few "shovel leaners." But, also, Mr. President, it will restore the dignity which can only come from productive work for thousands of individuals who have become accustomed to hopelessness, despair, and laziness in that order.

EMPLOYER OF LAST RESORT

Prof. Garth Mangum points out in a recent paper that:

Ways may be found to attract employers to depressed areas and neighborhoods, or to get the unemployed and underemployed out of them. Until then—and the day appears far off—reasonably adequate solutions to the social and personal problems of the employable but competitively disadvantaged will require the government to act as "employer of last resort."

Finally, Mr. President, I have pointed out numerous times that the administration has been plagued by a definite performance gap between promises and results. Part of the reason for this performance gap has been an apparent inability to attack any one area of poverty with the determination and drive necessary to eliminate that particular problem. In the area of job training the performance gap is all too apparent for thousands of unemployed and low income individuals who continue to become more economically disadvantaged each day. For too many of them federally sponsored job training programs have been but an illusion. Their lives have remained unaffected in any way, shape or form.

I believe, Mr. President, the enactment of the Emergency Employment Act as changed by my amendment would diminish the performance gap now plaguing the Federal Government. More important, Mr. President, it would enable thousands of individuals who have become victims of abject poverty and the welfare dole to lead a meaningful life.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I point out briefly the effects of this proposed amendment.

First, it would cut title II authorization from \$2.8 billion to \$875 million, plus \$50 million for interest-free repayable loans for purchase of training equipment and supplies.

Second, it would permit the Secretary of Labor to use up to \$328,125,000 of the \$875 million for human investment training programs by private industry, pursuant to plans approved by the Secretary.

Third, it would permit the Secretary of Labor to use up to \$175 million of the \$875 million for on-the-job training and other programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Fourth, it would require the Secretary of Labor to give priority in filling all employment and training openings created

by title II programs to unemployed and low-income persons who are the heads of families.

Fifth, it would expand the definition of "eligible areas" to include rural areas with problems of outmigration.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this represents a reasonable compromise between the positions of those who favor the adoption of title II of the bill in its present form and those who would eliminate it entirely. Also, Mr. President, my amendment concentrates more on training programs, making it possible for the unemployed and the underemployed to acquire skills necessary and essential to enable them to become productive, self-supporting citizens.

I very much hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will look with favor upon my proposal.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am very much interested in the Senator's proposal. As he knows, he and I have discussed it, and I have discussed it with some of my Democratic colleagues on the subcommittee which held the initial hearings on this bill.

I should like to see whether the Senator and I are in accord—and I will not detain him long—as to the basic principles of his amendment.

I understand, first, that the amendment would cut the authorization from a 2-year authorization to a 1-year authorization. Is that correct?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. In the original Emergency Employment Act which I introduced, and which the committee brought to the floor, the authorization for the first year would have been \$1.3 billion, of which \$300 million would have been set aside for tooling up, hardware, and making available the facilities through which the program would operate.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. What the Senator has done has been to reduce that \$1.3 billion to \$925 million, of which \$50 million would be set aside for tooling up and hardware?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; and I think it should be pointed out that the \$50 million is in the form of loans which will be repayable.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct; and they are non-interest-bearing loans?

Mr. PROUTY. That is right.

Mr. CLARK. My third point would be that the Senator's amendment puts greater stress on the job training than does the original Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. As the Senator knows, I feel very strongly about that. It is one of the most important things we must do if we are to enable people who are now unemployable to learn skills and becoming self-supporting.

Mr. CLARK. I share the Senator's view than on-the-job training needs as much emphasis as we can reasonably give it, and the on-the-job training emphasis is directed at the hard-core poor who are unemployable, is it not?

Mr. PROUTY. That is true.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand, the Senator intends, under part (b) of his amendment, which I think is referred to as the human investment part of the amendment, to give encouragement to private industry to employ hard-core poor after adequate on-the-job training. In order to do that, there is an inducement to private industry in the form of the payment of a subsidy—perhaps the Senator would prefer some other word; that is the first word that occurred to me—represented by the difference between what it costs to train a hard-core poor individual and what it would cost to train an ordinary employee.

Mr. PROUTY. That is the purpose of the amendment, and of my approach in the human investment program.

Mr. CLARK. With respect to part (b), the Senator's amendment leaves a good deal of flexibility to the Secretary of Labor, does it not, in that the Secretary would have discretion, within a limitation of a low of 12½ percent of the \$875 million and a high of 37½ percent of the \$875 million, as to how much should be utilized for the human investment program and how much should stay within the original conception of the Emergency Employment Act?

Mr. PROUTY. That is within the discretion of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CLARK. So without being very adept at doing mathematics in my head—perhaps the Senator or his staff has done it—what does the 12½ percent figure come to, and what does the 37½ percent figure come to?

Mr. PROUTY. The 12½ percent figure is \$109,375,000; the 37½ percent figure is \$328,125,000.

Mr. CLARK. So, roughly speaking and rounding out the figures, if the Secretary has to take the lower amount, there would be a high in excess of \$700 million left for the emergency employment part of the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Offhand I think the Senator is approximately correct.

Mr. CLARK. If the Secretary were to take the higher figure of 37½ percent, there would still be in excess of \$500 million, would there not, for the emergency part of the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is true.

Mr. CLARK. I overheard the colloquy between the Senator and his able staff member about the MDTA. Perhaps the Senator will explain to what extent, if at all, that enters into this discussion.

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly in addition to the human investment part of the amendment there is a 10 percent minimum earmarked under MDTA which would amount to \$87.5 million. The maximum which could be spent would be \$175 million.

Mr. CLARK. That would be in addition would it, to the \$109 million and the \$300-odd million we spoke about before?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. I point out to the Senator, however, that while this is a 1-year authorization, the amendment contains a provision to make funds available until they have been expended.

Mr. CLARK. I understand. Would the Senator, as an experienced legislator, agree with me, it now being the first week in October—and since we are expecting

problems in the House and a conference which could be long winded, and a possible veto, although we hope not—that it is not very likely that this legislation will become law much before the end of the year.

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is a fair assumption.

Mr. CLARK. So that one-half of the fiscal year 1968 would have passed before this money could even begin to be made available.

Mr. PROUTY. That is very true, and quite frankly, that is one reason why I felt we could reduce the funds rather substantially without curtailing the effect of the poverty program which the Senator and I favor.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator has a good point there. I am more favorably disposed toward his amendment, although I might say quite candidly that I am not in a position to accept it tonight.

I am not at all sure that I can accept it at all. However, I do want to think about it very hard, because it would be very difficult for the Secretary to spend in this fiscal year all the money provided in the original Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is true. I appreciate the fact that the Senator is going to give appropriate thought to the proposal which I am sure he appreciates is offered in good faith.

I am very much concerned about what I consider to be our No. 1 domestic problem which is the prevalence of poverty. While the Senator and I do not agree on everything, I think philosophically we feel that this is a problem which we must approach along the lines which he and I both seem to feel is desirable and essential.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator and I are in accord that something must be done to give employment potential to the hard core poor who are of employable age. And I agree with the Senator that something more needs to be done with respect to training them in employable skills.

The Senator and I are both realists, and we know that there are limits to what we can expect the Senate to do in this regard, and perhaps even greater limits to what we can expect the House to do.

I commend the Senator for the efforts he has made in working out what may well become an acceptable compromise for the Senate.

So that we can have an appropriate RECORD, I wonder if the Senate would permit me to ask him a couple of additional questions so that I can be sure I understand the full purport of the amendment.

Section 214 of the Senator's amendment would prohibit financial assistance by the Secretary except upon approval of a plan submitted by an employer who desires to receive financial assistance under part (b), the human investment job training part of the Emergency Employment Act.

I take it that refers to a written plan.

That plan is required to include under section 214(g):

Information respecting the cost of usual training and other usual services provided

employees other than those described in Section 206 of this title, in order to make them fully productive.

They are there described as hard-core corps.

Reading this section in conjunction with section 213 which authorizes financial assistance for training and employment costs including "unusual training and other unusual services for a limited period when an employee might not be fully productive" would require the Secretary of Labor to determine the unusual training and employment costs by first requiring the establishment of the usual training and employment costs under the plan.

In other words, to make a figure available, we have to know what it would ordinarily cost them and then how much it would cost for this hard-core corps.

Mr. PROUTY. That is absolutely true.

We think this is set forth under section 214(g) of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. In this connection I would think it appropriate for the Secretary to take into account in determining such usual training and other employment costs the following information in addition to other information which the Secretary might require:

First, it would seem to me that the employer should provide the Secretary with a description of the training and services usually provided its new employees. That description should include the usual duration of such training and an analysis of the employer's training costs during a substantial period prior to the submission of the plan.

Second, it would seem to me relevant for the Secretary to consider the normal turnover rates of the employer's employees information on work injuries and absenteeism of employees performing work similar to that which is expected to be performed by low-income or unemployed persons who are to be employed under the plan.

Third, I think some information should also be provided on the productivity and efficiency of the employer's employees.

Lastly, the Secretary may wish to require that the employer provide other information in order to enable the Secretary to determine the amount and rate of financial assistance to be provided an employer for the hiring of poor people under the Senator's amendment.

I am wondering whether the Senator would agree with these observations?

I think it important that the Secretary of Labor have enough flexibility in determining the employer's usual training and other services costs and in determining the information necessary to be included under the plan so that the Secretary would be able to exercise an informed judgment as to the amount of financial assistance to be provided.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. And I think this is still at the discretion of the Secretary. I think the language is sufficiently clear so that there is no doubt about certain restrictions which may be placed upon him.

Mr. CLARK. I have another point which disturbs me a little, but I suspect that the Senator is in accord with me on this.

Further, in connection with subsection 214(g), I am concerned that there are no specific legislative safeguards prohibiting the use of the financial assistance provided under the Senator's amendment to assure that this assistance is not used by an employer who typically and normally has a high turnover rate for his employees. I would hope that the Senator from Vermont would agree that the human investment job training program should not be used by employers which have typically high turnover rates. I do not think it would be advisable, for example, to have a small shop of one sort or another which normally hires persons on a short-term basis receive aid under this act. I am sure the Senator would agree that the purpose of his human investment job training amendment is to create permanent jobs and not merely temporary jobs in industries where turnover rates are particularly high.

Mr. PROUTY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. The third point is that section 213(a) authorizes financial assistance to employers for "training and employment costs incurred pursuant to the plan described in section 214. I think the act is quite clear what the term "training and employment costs" refers to for sections 213(a), (1) through (4) indicate the kinds of reimbursements which would be made by the Secretary to an employer. I would like to ask the Senator from Vermont if he would not agree with me that the language on its face is quite clear that employment costs refers to matters contained within section 213(a) and does not refer to wages, and that his amendment would not authorize a wage subsidy.

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that is the Senator's understanding and I believe he is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to have the Senator make that point.

My semifinal point I wish to raise, as a matter of legislative history, is that subsection 213(a)(2) authorizes the payment of all or part of employer costs of sending recruiters into areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-income persons. Would the Senator from Vermont agree that this provision is not intended to duplicate or replace existing recruitment efforts by the U.S. Employment Service and the State public employment offices or other public or private agencies which are currently engaged in the recruitment of unemployed or low-income persons?

Mr. PROUTY. No, it would not duplicate their efforts. It would be an additional means of finding some of the people, if necessary, who need this help. It would not in any sense supplant the activities of the U.S. Employment Service or of State employment services.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, there is an analogy between the human investment job training amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont and the present practices of the Department of Labor in connection with the on-the-job training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Would not the Senator agree that, where appropriate, the rules and regulations estab-

lished for training under MDTA by the Department of Labor be made applicable to the human investment job training provisions proposed by the Senator from Vermont where such rules and regulations could be adapted to fit the provisions of the Senator's amendment, so we will not be establishing another jungle of bureaucratic rules with situations which in many ways are substantially identical?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that is a logical approach, but I should say to the Senator that the final decision must be up to the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator very much for his candid answers to my questions and I assure him that overnight I will give prayerful consideration to accepting his amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I hope very much that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will find it possible to accept the amendment, after he has had an opportunity to think about it.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his support of this proposal and for his having worked out what I believe is a very useful alternative, which I hope will be favorably acted upon by the Senate.

I support the proposal. I have joined in it with the Senator from Vermont. I hope for its success, and I hope that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania may find that he also will be able to support the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania. I must say that his cooperation and help in drafting this amendment have been extremely valuable. I share his hope that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will find it possible to accept our proposal.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In title II of the bill before us, the language would authorize \$1 billion for fiscal year 1968 and \$1.5 billion for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There would also be an authorization for loans in the amount of \$300 million.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As I understand the distinguished Senator's amendment to my motion, one of the changes that would be embodied in the instructions which he proposes would be a limitation on the authorization to \$875 million until expended.

Mr. PROUTY. Plus \$50 million for repayable loans, which are noninterest loans but are repayable.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. This brings me to the question I was about to ask the Senator. I have not had an opportunity to read his statement, but I was going to ask whether or not he intended to provide any monies for loans.

Mr. PROUTY. There is \$50 million in the amendment for loans.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So there will be \$50 million instead of the \$300 million as provided in the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. There is \$50 million in addition to the \$875 million authorization.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So the \$875 million would be in grants, and there would be a total of \$50 million in loans?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, although I am a cosponsor with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] of the original bill which is sought now to be amended, it is my judgment that the scheme adopted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] sharpens and makes even more specific the private enterprise job which I had in mind in effecting several amendments to the bill in its original form which I worked out with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I think that the Senator from Vermont has rendered us all a valuable service by sharpening and committing specific sums of money for that purpose. In many respects, this amendment proposes incentives to private industry like those I sponsored under section 123(a)(8) of title I of the act, and extends those incentives to something beyond a pilot program in size.

He has limited the program to 1 year. I think that program is more important than that limitation. Therefore, it shall be my intention to support the Senator from Vermont, and I hope very much the majority of the Senate will do the same. I have examined the needs closely and I am more than ever convinced that jobs must be our first priority in attacking the problem of poverty. This bill would provide those needed jobs.

OPPOSITION TO TITLE II

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there can be no question about the desirability of eradicating poverty, and no question at all about the necessity of helping those who are in genuine need. Speaking as one who knows about the pangs of poverty from firsthand experience, I can say that improving the opportunities for all Americans to share in the fruits of an affluent society—and I emphasize the word opportunities—is a commendable and worthwhile national objective.

But in my view, there are serious questions about the validity of some of the premises and some of the statistics on which the war on poverty is based. And there are even more serious questions about the effectiveness of a number of phases of the effort which the Office of Economic Opportunity is making. I have serious reservations about continuing to fund some of these programs in the amounts sought, or, for that matter, in any amount whatsoever.

In many instances the results we had hoped for as a consequence of the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—which I supported—have not been attained. And they may not be attained, for it is doubtful to me that the OEO, or any other agency that can be

devised, is going to be able to wipe out poverty in this or any other country. I believe that eradicating poverty is much more related to the individual and his own efforts than it is to federal undertakings of this nature. This is not to say that the Federal Government should not assist.

A thought-provoking article entitled "Is United States Really Filled With Poverty?" appeared on page 50 of U.S. News & World Report for September 4, 1967, which I believe could profitably be read by any person concerned about the problem of poverty in this country. I ask unanimous consent that this article be labeled exhibit A and be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Before additional billions are voted for the war on poverty, there are many facts that should be weighed. I shall call attention in these remarks to a few of them.

The word poverty has emotional connotations. Our sympathies are stirred at thoughts of the less fortunate and the disadvantaged, and properly so. Providing equal opportunity for all is among the noblest ideals which we profess.

But reality should guide us, and it is my opinion that a good many misleading or at least questionable statistics have been advanced as to the number of individuals and families that actually live in poverty in America and who can be motivated to make the effort to lift themselves out of the poverty strata.

In the U.S. News article to which I referred, John B. Parrish, professor of economics at the University of Illinois, does much, I think, to put this problem in proper perspective and focus. The author has been on the Illinois faculty for 20 years and, before that, was an economist and statistician with the War Labor Board and the War Manpower Commission in Washington. For 3 years he was Chicago regional director of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

He brands as "poverty fallacy No. 1" the estimates of the number of Americans living in poverty. The figures I have heard most commonly quoted place this number at 30 to 35 million. But some members of what Dr. Parrish calls the "poverty cult"—meaning those persons, or groups, who go the farthest in advocating antipoverty measures—put the number at 40 to 50 million, and a few, using some yardstick that is utterly incomprehensible to me, would contend that as many as 80 million Americans are victims of poverty. Here is part of what Dr. Parrish wrote:

Poverty fallacy No. 1 got its big push from the 1964 report on "The Problem of Poverty in America," by the Council of Economic Advisers. CEA determined that households with less than \$3,000 annual income were in poverty. Using this income yardstick, it was determined that 20 per cent of U.S. households containing 30 million persons were in the poverty class.

The truth about poverty-income statistics is this: Under no reasonable assumptions does income below \$3,000 indicate poverty

status. It may or may not, and to say otherwise is not only erroneous but absurd.

Let's take as an example a young married couple, the Smiths. They are attending college. They constitute a statistical household. Their annual income is \$1,500 a year. They are not being "hopelessly" shut out from the good things of life. They are, along with other American youth, enjoying a rate of access to higher education greater than the youth of any country, any time, any place. They enjoy electric lighting, refrigeration, adequate if not fancy food, and a second-hand automobile or motorcycle. They would like a new Cadillac, but will manage without one. They aren't "poor" and need no crocodile tears shed in their behalf.

At the other end of the life cycle are the Joneses. Mr. Jones has been a machinist all his life. He and Mrs. Jones had always wanted to visit the country's great national parks after the children had grown up and left. So he has opted to retire at age 60. The retirement income will come to only \$2,000 a year. Are they poor? The poverty cult says, "Yes," these people are suffering from deprivation. They have been "hopelessly" cast aside. Yet the truth is they have a small home paid for, a modest automobile paid for. They enjoy refrigeration, automatic cooking equipment, inside plumbing, TV, enough clothes to last for years—the accumulation of a lifetime. And now they propose to enjoy more leisure, in more comfort, for more years than similar working-class families of any country, any time. The Joneses think the Council of Economic Advisers is statistically wacky.

And take the Browns. They are in the middle years. Both Mr. and Mrs. Brown work. Their three children are in school. They have a modest new home, partially paid for, some savings, some insurance, good clothes—yes, and a paid-for refrigerator and TV set. They have a new car and six installments still outstanding. Mr. Brown becomes ill. Mrs. Brown quits work to take care of him. Their income drops to below \$3,000 for the year. Are they in trouble? Yes. Are they in desperate consumer poverty? Are they "hopelessly trapped?" By no means. After a tough year they will resume as members of the affluent society even by CEA's definition.

These cases could be multiplied endlessly, I think. If poverty is to be measured or defined on the basis of income and size of family alone, or the difference between low and high income brackets without taking into consideration all the other factors which are pertinent, then we will, indeed, always have poverty with us.

I do not believe that poverty can be predicated solely, or even mainly, on the basis of income or on family size. Such data form an insufficient basis on which to proceed, for they omit such estimates, which Dr. Parrish cites, as these:

Ninety-five percent of U.S. families have an adequate minimum daily diet; 99 percent of all U.S. households have adequate cooking equipment including those living in both urban and rural "ghettos"; 99 percent of U.S. households have refrigeration; 96 percent of U.S. families who want it have television; 98 percent of U.S. mothers give birth to their babies in hospitals; 95 percent of U.S. households have telephones.

Moreover, America's vast resale market makes all kind of consumer-type durable goods available to those in low-income groups at a fraction of their original cost. Refrigerators, automobiles, TV sets, record players, furniture—these and other items are sold and resold as

used goods. Instead of being shut out, our low-income families are, in many instances, gaining more in the way of necessities and conveniences than they have ever had before.

I do not contend that they, the low-income families, have everything they need or should aspire to. Far from it. But I do say emphatically that it is my opinion that the bleak picture of 30 to 35 million Americans living in the depths of poverty, existing on a bare subsistence level, is a badly overdrawn and distorted picture.

Now, let us look briefly at three of the more controversial programs of the war on poverty about which I have the strongest reservations. I refer specifically to the Job Corps, some of the community action programs, and the activities of the VISTA workers.

In the case of the Job Corps, the data are confusing and conflicting and tend generally to indicate that the program is not doing what it was intended to do; namely, to fit disadvantaged youths for holding other than make-work jobs.

Some educators and sociologists believe that the theory behind the program is faulty. They question the wisdom of removing youths from their homes and training them for situations that may or may not exist in their home communities or anywhere else.

Many who are best versed in this phase of the war on poverty believe that not enough use is being made of existing educational and vocational training facilities; that the "education" these youths are receiving is poor; and that there has not been enough involvement of State educational agencies in the program. It seems evident that there is too much overlapping and duplication of both Federal and State educational and manpower training and retraining programs.

But most seriously I question the great cost of this program when viewed in the light of the results it has produced so far.

The figures on the cost annually per enrollee have been widely discussed. The committee report on the pending bill shows that during the first 3 fiscal years \$715 million has been allocated to the Job Corps for its operation. The direct operating cost per enrollee was \$6,900 for the 1967 fiscal year for the centers in operation 9 months or more, which is under the ceiling of \$7,500 per enrollee imposed by a 1966 amendment to the 1964 act, and which the new bill would reduce to \$7,300 per enrollee.

But additional overhead and capital costs raised the cost for each enrollee by any average of \$600. The direct operating costs for men's urban centers averaged just under \$7,500 and for the women's centers just under \$8,500. The cost for the conservation centers was \$6,100 plus \$854 per conservation center enrollee, or a total of \$6,954 per enrollee.

Without making any invidious comparisons with other private educational costs, it must be obvious to all that, when no one knows exactly what results are being achieved, these costs are inordinately high.

Statements which one sees now and then in the public press and elsewhere

to the effect that the youths trained in the Job Corps centers will return more than the cost of their training in the future taxes they will pay and the good they will do for society are, at best, only guesses. Assumptions that welfare costs for the youths involved will be reduced or eliminated are equally nebulous, for, as the minority report on the bill notes, many who have received public assistance receive it again after finishing their "training."

As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce noted in its comprehensive study of the Job Corps earlier this year:

The Job Corps is doing very little directly to aid the graduates in job placement. . . . About 60 percent of the Corpsmen found their jobs themselves. Even when the Job Corps did assist in placement, responses from graduates indicate that an effort was not always made to match previous training and job specifications.¹

The chamber of commerce study made the additional point that employers hold the graduates of the Job Corps in low regard. The most disturbing result of its investigation, the chamber said, was that roughly 74 percent of the Job Corps graduates covered by the study were no longer employed in the job in which the Job Corps indicated they were placed.

Moreover, the press has reported many incidents, occurring both at the Job Corps centers and in neighboring cities and towns, in which enrollees have participated in unlawful or disruptive activities. Often it has been reported that enrollees who have committed crimes were not subjected to punishment. This has evoked criticism and antagonism, especially from citizens residing near Job Corps centers.

Many of the incidents that have marred the image of the Job Corps probably have been due to poor screening methods. The Job Corps has said that it has no way of checking whether a man is on parole or probation when he applies. They refuse to require fingerprints from enrollees—despite the fact that members of the Armed Forces and Government employees have their fingerprints taken automatically.

I do not say that the Job Corps should accept only those boys with clean records, but I do say that the Job Corps administrators should know enough about each boy's background to be able to reject him, if need be, or, once enrolled, to handle him effectively. Many of the scandals and riots that have plagued the Job Corps may have been avoided if the camp leaders had known which boys had the most serious problems and had helped them accordingly or had rejected or dismissed them.

Turning to the community action phase of the war on poverty, I have been disturbed by reports reaching me from my State that in some instances these programs are being subverted by "leadership" which seems to be ideologically opposed to what it openly refers to as "the power structure," or contemptuously calls "the establishment." The ob-

¹ "Youth and the War on Poverty," February 24, 1967, The Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

jective of some community action leaders in some communities appears mainly to be the overthrow of this "establishment."

I have had reports that in some communities persons associated with the poverty programs are openly talking of "running candidates for office," who presumably would be amenable to the points of view of "do-gooder" or extremist types of leadership, whether that fitted into a community pattern or not. I regret to say that some reports reaching me indicate that social misfits and malcontents have, in some cases, infiltrated the war on poverty and have become its leaders.

Local initiative and local participation in Federal programs are rightly regarded as essential in the effective development and carrying out of many such programs. But in some communities responsible leaders have shied away from having anything to do with the war on poverty. In my judgment, the OEO has failed significantly to involve progressive yet sound local leadership in many communities.

The objective in some instances appears to have been to incite hatred and anger, to build up class consciousness and to foment unrest instead of to provide constructive leadership. In one West Virginia city—Bluefield—a mimeographed notice of a community action meeting circulated in a predominantly Negro neighborhood began with these provocative words:

Are you tired of being stepped on? . . . Are you satisfied with the prevailing conditions?

I ask unanimous consent that this item be included as exhibit B at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, other inflammatory pamphlets and literature have been circulated in what seems to be a deliberate effort to take advantage of the community action programs to agitate for increased welfare benefits and to gain other similar ends. As an example, I have some literature which was recently sent to me by an elected State official and which has been circulated by poverty workers to welfare recipients. I ask unanimous consent that this literature be inserted as exhibit C at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is fine, in theory, to involve the poor in community endeavors for their own purported betterment. But where the poor have had little experience and practice in such matters, they all too often can be misled by persons who have their own, not the poor's, interests and welfare in mind.

The issues appear to me to revolve around poor implementation of a number of the poverty programs, ineffective operation, loose administrative control, and the weaknesses inherent in the concept of such programs as the Job Corps, some of the community action programs, and some of the VISTA activities.

The legislation before us amends and revises the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. It broadens the program at the same time it purportedly seeks to correct the weaknesses to which I have referred. I do not believe that some of them have been corrected. Too often it appears that special interest groups coming into a community from outside it have seized the initiative at the local level, and that they are using the community action setup as a vehicle for their own special purposes, which all too often do not coincide with the basic purposes and aims of the war on poverty. As a result, a great deal of social dissension has been stirred up, a new class-consciousness has been introduced, much public disenchantment has resulted, and, in my judgment, a great deal of money has been wasted.

I cite a letter, dated August 14, 1967, from Gov. Hulett C. Smith, of my State, to Director R. Sargent Shriver of the OEO, in which the Governor of West Virginia states that he would not give his permission or approval "today" to the VISTA and Appalachian volunteer phases of the war on poverty which he has approved for the past summer.

In his letter Governor Smith said:

Earlier this year, I approved for the second summer the placement of Appalachian Volunteers in the State of West Virginia under the auspices of the VISTA program. In so doing, I approved the return of the AV's in the face of a considerable amount of public protest from communities where they had served before, with some persons taking exception to the philosophy and activities of the group in the community, but with a majority protesting alleged immorality, uncleanness, unconventionality and personal obnoxiousness by some of the AV's working in the State during the summer of 1966.

However, it was my feeling at that time that the good being done by these young people outweighed the flaws and peccadilloes being manifested by some of them.

In recent weeks, incidents have occurred which—to be quite frank—cause me to question whether I exercised my best judgment in approving the 1967 AV contract.

Briefly related, these incidents are:

1. A group of persons identified as AV's and VISTA personnel staged a riotous all-night party on July 22 at Babcock State Park—destroying park property, interfering with the exit and entrance of other park guests, tampering with automobiles and generally disturbing the peace. This is documented in the attached report from the park superintendent, which points out that several of these persons used Federal Government automobiles, raising the possible question of misuse of U.S. Government property (as well as being abominable public relations for the national Administration). The superintendent's report has been carefully checked, and verified in almost every detail.

2. Reports from Wyoming County, West Virginia, indicate that confidence in, and effectiveness of, the VISTA-AV program has been seriously weakened by immoral conduct on the part of several of those volunteers. While these persons logically argue that their personal lives are their own affair, the fact remains that promiscuity, particularly when it crosses racial lines, is not accepted by the community as a whole and damages public respect and support for the VISTA and AV program.

3. On August 6, pickets protesting U.S. participation in the Viet Nam war staged a demonstration on the lawn of the State Capitol. The protest, which was peaceful and orderly, included five VISTA-AV workers from Raleigh County. While I affirm their right to their own views on the Vietnamese

situation, the fact that they drove to Charleston in a clearly-marked U.S. Government car, which was parked near the Capitol, attracted considerable attention, as the attached State Police report reveals. The use of a Federally-owned car for such purposes certainly is open to question.

4. A respected State Senator, Carl E. Gainer, from central West Virginia has protested formally to me about the activities of VISTA and AV workers in Nicholas County. These persons apparently have called for the mass dismissal of a number of the county's elected officials and school personnel. While such social protest might be valid, the absence of constructive alternatives to the problems of the community has led to a general feeling that the VISTA-AV group is composed of "trouble-makers" who offer only negative solutions to community problems. Charges of teaching "ideas that are Communistic" have been made. Enclosed are copies of the letters outlining this problem.

5. The arrest of a group of VISTA-AV workers in a nearby county of Kentucky on charges of sedition, and their alleged possession of Communist literature and paraphernalia, has been widely reported by West Virginia news media, and has served further to undermine confidence in the VISTA-AV program.

Since I was given assurances that the 1967 Appalachian Volunteer Program would be more tightly controlled to the extent of picking persons of greater maturity and judgment and screening out those individuals whose Bohemian habits might render the program effete, I feel I have no alternative but to call this evident breach of those assurances to your attention.

It remains my contention that a program such as the Appalachian Volunteers can be a positive force for community betterment and assisting the poor to higher standards of living and aspiration.

However, it is also my contention that the poor—and the image of your office—both would be far better served if these persons were oriented in the common courtesies; inspired to set a truly good example for the people they serve in grooming, manners, dress and demeanor; and that they be impressed with the fact that they are representative of the Federal Government (and, in the eyes of many persons, government and authority in general), and as such, should try to be circumspect to the point of extreme prudence in their personal appearance, conduct and attitudes.

In conclusion, may I state that I feel the guarantees given me in the spring by VISTA officials and Mr. Milton Ogle, director of the Appalachian Volunteers program, have been disregarded or abrogated. In the light of the summer's developments, I certainly would not give my approval to such a program if it were before me today.

I believe you personally should know of these problems and incidents, for I am certain we share a desire to make the Economic Opportunity program as effective as possible in West Virginia.

The sedition charges to which Governor Smith referred made some very unfavorable national news for the poverty program. Charges that antipoverty workers were seeking the overthrow of the government of Kentucky and of Pike County were involved.

It is true that these charges of sedition were voided by a three-judge Federal court, which held that the Kentucky law on which they were based is unconstitutional. Nevertheless, a Pike County, Ky., grand jury found enough evidence to indict five persons for sedition, and a wide area of eastern Kentucky has been wracked by destructive controversy as a result of the activities of antipoverty workers.

Excuses, explanations, and defenses too frequently have been offered by the OEO as a result of criticisms and charges such as this.

The New York Times reported on September 4 that—

An inspector for the Office of Economic Opportunity has concluded that a sedition charge against Joseph Mulloy (one of the five persons involved), a poverty worker in the mountains around Pikeville, Kentucky, is based entirely on local issues.

The news story said further that the inspector for the CEO stated that he found "no basis for the sedition charges."

This sort of defensive report has come from the OEO many times when it has been criticized, which indicates to me that the agency actually has little control at the local level over a number of activities carried on in its name.

But it will not be sufficient, in my opinion, for it to say that it has no control, or little control, over volunteer workers such as the Appalachian volunteers, for they are paid in part by poverty funds and are thoroughly identified in the public mind with the poverty program.

The five persons in Kentucky were not directly employed by the OEO, but they were identified in the public eye with its activities, and at least one of them, Mulloy, was supported in a substantial degree by Federal funds. So the damage is done. The poverty program, by the very nature of the way in which it is set up, is given another nationwide black eye.

In a feature article, the Sunday, August 27, 1967, Washington Post stated in the opening paragraph:

Are Federal tax dollars paid to anti-poverty workers subsidizing sedition in Kentucky?

This is a serious question to raise in the minds of the public which must support the antipoverty endeavors if they are to be successful.

But even more important than this, in the case of Pike County, Ky., which borders my own State, is the fact that outside agitators in the guise of seeking to help the poor natives have, instead, brought on deep dissension and set neighbor against neighbor. In the process they have helped no one. They have certainly not eradicated poverty.

There is no doubt in my mind that the persons indicted for sedition in Kentucky, along with many of those who have stirred up controversy in West Virginia and elsewhere, whether they realize it or not, are virtually revolutionaries bent on destroying the present order of society instead of trying to improve conditions within the framework that exists.

I am happy to say that Director Shriver subsequently cut off all funds for the Appalachian volunteer program in Kentucky at the request of Gov. Edward T. Breathitt following the charges of sedition.

All too often, complaints to the Office of Economic Opportunity regarding community action activities elicit only defensive responses. Charges of misconduct on the part of poverty workers are seemingly sloughed off, casually brushed aside, and made to appear as nothing out of the ordinary with regard to citizen

conduct. The OEO response to Governor Smith's charges seemed to me to conform, in some respects, to such a pattern. I ask unanimous consent to insert the OEO reply as exhibit D at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit D.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I must also say, in all fairness, that I have had some good reports, as well as bad, regarding the VISTA program. I would not want it to appear that I condemn this antipoverty program in its entirety—a point about which I wish to say a few words more in order to clarify my position.

In the field of mental health in my State, for example, I am informed that Dr. Mildred Mitchell-Bateman, West Virginia's State director of mental health, has been publicly quoted in the press to the effect that the VISTA program has been effective and valuable.

In fact, she said that the work of VISTA volunteers with emotionally disturbed West Virginians, in their communities and in the State's mental hospitals, has saved the State an estimated \$486,000 in custodial care, funds that are being used to help provide better services.

Dr. Bateman said that the VISTA's also had helped to organize Boy Scout troops in rural areas for the first time, as well as day-care centers for children, tutoring programs for elementary and high school pupils and services for the retarded.

Dr. Bateman said:*

In all these activities, the VISTAs are training local people to take over when they leave. This is really a program in which VISTAs try to work themselves out of a job.

Governor Smith, I believe, concurs in this evaluation.

However, I have received many complaints from dependable sources concerning the activities of some of the VISTA workers. Just the other day, on September 22 to be exact, through questions addressed to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] I expressed some concern and reservations anent VISTA. The Senator subsequently, on September 25, submitted for the RECORD certain documentation in support of VISTA, including exhibits attesting to the value of VISTA's mental health program in West Virginia.

I was, of course, aware of the complimentary reports concerning the mental health program, having heard directly from Dr. Mildred Mitchell-Bateman, West Virginia's director of mental health, and from a few county directors of mental health programs in the State.

But the part does not make the whole, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed, as exhibit E at the conclusion of my remarks, a sampling of the correspondence which has reached my office from so many people of my State and which reflects in the opinion of many persons, a poor image of VISTA workers in general, as observed in West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

* *Charleston Gazette*, p. 3, August 23, 1967.

(See exhibit E.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, these reports include, for example:

First. Strong criticism of the VISTA program in his county by the sheriff of Raleigh County and a plea for an investigation of the actions of VISTA workers. Seven months later, after what he characterizes as a "job of whitewashing" by OEO officials, he still urged investigation.

Second. An expression of belief by a well-known real estate operator that VISTA workers 18 or 19 years old, untrained, and "looking in most cases more in need than our own people," cannot accomplish much in the promotion of a "better life for those in the rural areas," and a request that something "be done about this reckless spending of our tax money."

Third. An expression of alarm by a member of the West Virginia Senate who characterizes the VISTA workers in his district as "a bunch of improperly misguided misfits who are endangering our concept of law and order in this Nation."

Fourth. A protest by a high school librarian in Nicholas County of the "smirching of our schools with dope raids, long-haired, rude, and untidy students, moral problems, and the like," resulting from the presence of anti-poverty workers, who sought the forced resignation of duly appointed school authorities.

Fifth. A report by a grocery store manager of VISTA workers headquartered in Mingo County, driving a Government car, exhibiting rude and intimidating manners in his place of business.

Sixth. A request from a postmaster that an effort be made to "get these people—VISTA workers—out of here," since "they are telling the people here that they are not getting what is due them."

Seventh. A report by the chief of police of Huntington concerning attempts to "set up black power movement meetings" by individuals believed to be OEO employees from New York City and Norman, Okla. If OEO, they may or may not be VISTA workers; OEO has not reported the facts.

Eighth. Reports by an outstanding lawyer regarding slovenly, unclean VISTA employees inciting political disorder and stirring up dissatisfaction against "the taxpayers of this country" who are paying the bill and "have a right to expect better treatment."

Ninth. A sampling of letters from interested citizens, who will be identified by their initials.

In summary, the picture of VISTA in West Virginia is one of certain individuals who have come to our State from other parts of the country, some of whom are carelessly dressed and look worse than even the poorest of our people, and who have sometimes served to create and foment unrest, dissatisfaction, and trouble. If VISTA is to continue, its image and its programs would be far better served if these workers were, in the words of the Governor, oriented in the common courtesies; inspired to set a truly good example for the people they serve in grooming, manners, dress, and de-

meanor; and circumspect to the point of extreme prudence in their personal appearance, conduct, and attitudes.

I have had excellent reports on the adult basic education program, and the Headstart program, both of which are other component of the community action phase of the legislation before us. The basic criticism I have heard regarding Headstart is that it should be under the jurisdiction of local school systems rather than under community action direction.

As the adult education effort has been conducted in my State and elsewhere it seems to have fortified and strengthened existing adult education programs and contributed to improving the lot of the undereducated.

More than 10,000 persons have been involved in this program in my State in the past 3 years, and our State department of education reports that the overall average of public education in the State will be increased by as much as two full grade levels as a result of the program.

For example, I have been advised by Mr. James Basil Deck, State supervisor of the adult basic education program for the West Virginia Department of Education, that 4,800 individuals have moved off the welfare rolls during the past 2 years, these individuals having gone through the adult basic education class. Many have just learned to read and write and have upgraded educational skills and have been able to move out and get jobs. Mr. Deck advised me that there are 6,071 AFDCUP participants in the adult basic education classes this year; 846 are in high school equivalency classes; and 451 are in vocational classes, making a total of 7,368.

I am informed that there were over 16,000 students in classes during the past year and that it is expected to be about the same number this year. Mr. Deck stated that many of these individuals take the general adult development tests for high school equivalency. Moreover, he stated that 25 students in classes have enrolled in college this year. So, from the reports I have received, an excellent job is being done in the adult education effort in West Virginia, an effort which improves basic education skills or upgrades skills to prepare for jobs. This is the kind of program that I wholeheartedly support.

I have had some equally good reports concerning the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which OEO farms out to the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I voted for the original economic opportunity legislation. The eradication of poverty where it is real and where the objective can be accomplished effectively is a worthwhile goal of which I approve and for the achievement of which I supported the original Economic Opportunity Act. I do feel, however, that the war on poverty needs a full-scale, in-depth inquiry and investigation. I am fully cognizant of the work which Senator CLARK's subcommittee has so ably performed in conducting hearings on this bill, and I would say nothing in derogation of this work. But I do not believe that this is sufficient. It is

my opinion that a thorough and comprehensive reappraisal of the war on poverty is needed, and I think that the kind of scrutiny required can only be provided by competent and trained persons skilled in investigative and auditing techniques.

I feel strongly that many of the community action programs have not been properly administered, properly directed, properly supervised, or properly audited. I also believe that if such an in-depth study of these programs were to be conducted, many disturbing, and even shocking, facts would be brought to light with regard to how these programs have been mismanaged, with a concomitant wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. Moreover, I am convinced in my own mind that some of the poverty workers have been utilized by misguided persons and even out-and-out revolutionaries, who have sought to achieve ends that have little or nothing to do with the stamping out of poverty. I am deeply disturbed at the many indications that some programs have been utilized to foment social protest, civil rights disturbances, and anti-Vietnam war demonstrations.

I was happy to support the amendment offered by Senator PROUTY on Friday, which would order the General Accounting Office to investigate the Office of Economic Opportunity and its local agencies in the war on poverty. I believe that this type of investigation by the GAO will help to determine the real efficiency of the administration of OEO programs and the extent to which such programs achieve the objectives as intended by Congress. I have a feeling that some of the shortcomings of the anti-poverty programs in the District of Columbia may be indicative of what is taking place throughout many areas of the country.

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, of which I am chairman, has information of interest in this regard.

The subcommittee has received information that indicates a grave weakness in the financial management of records and expenses maintained by one of the programs in the District of Columbia. In 1 month the organization responsible to the Washington Welfare Association claimed expenditures for positions which were vacant during that period. Expenditures for group health insurance premiums had also been overstated; bills for merchandise purchased by a former employee after his dismissal in the previous year had also been claimed as an expense reimbursable by the United Planning Organization.

As a further illustration of lack of adequate financial control and laxity in the management of the program there existed in one instance unsupported billings from a local store which had been paid and claimed as an expense, an excessive retroactive salary payment had been made to an employee, expenditures were repeatedly charged to incorrect program components, personnel costs have been overstated by 1 day for all employed positions of another development program, and in several instances commitments incurred during the prior

contract period had been paid from current contract funds.

Other reported deficiencies showed reimbursement twice to the activity for expenses that had been incurred during a period in calendar year 1966. Another instance of questionable practice concerned the accountant-office manager and her assistant, in that each received, in addition to her regular salary, one half of the funds available for a part-time accountant position in another activity of the area.

The reported deficiencies also revealed that inventory records for equipment furnished the area have not been maintained as required by agreements with the United Planning Organization.

With further regard to the additional payments to the accountant-office manager and clerk-typist, the two employees receive monthly salaries of \$667 and \$401 respectively, and each person was reportedly receiving an additional \$162 per month for performing the duties of the part-time workers in another development program. Justification of the additional payment to the two individuals related to the fact that each worked 10 hours per week in addition to her regular full-time working hours, and officials recognized the practice was not desirable but said they were not able to find the qualified neighborhood residents to fill the positions.

Another questionable practice concerns the use of poverty funds to pay certain administrative expenses of the credit union in the area rather than using the proceeds of credit union operations to pay those expenses, as is customary. There are over 1,200 members with share accounts totaling over \$86,000. It is reported that without the aid of poverty funds, the credit union would be facing financial difficulty. For example, in February 1967, it cost more than \$2,000 to make loans of \$6,802. Moreover, dividends which are now paid regularly could not be continued if earnings from less than \$100,000 of capital were required to pay expenses at the rate of \$22,509 for 10 months. Loan delinquencies of the union are said to have been increasing over the period of its operations. For example, on March 31, 1967, delinquent loans totaled \$8,612, 11.2 percent of loans outstanding of \$76,824, whereas on December 31, 1964, delinquent loans were only 3.9 percent of loans outstanding.

Another reported irregularity related to the child day care and Headstart programs. It was reported that the Office of Economic Opportunity income guidelines were not adhered to. A legal requirement of the 1964 act is that not more than 10 percent of families with children receiving day care who are enrolled in Headstart may have incomes higher than levels to be set under the act by OEO. It was found in this area that the act was not observed in some cases. At one day care program in the area, 16 of the 90 children were from over income families. It was noted that only eight of the 16 children whose incomes exceeded the OEO guidelines were charged a fee as required by the act.

Of the 30 children enrolled in two Headstart classes in the area in September 1966, it was found that six of the children's families had incomes at the time of enrollment which exceeded eligibility guidelines.

Mr. President, I shall probably have more to say, at a future date, about poverty programs in the District of Columbia area to which I have referred. I have merely alluded to the situation in that particular area of the District of Columbia at this time for the purpose of indicating the need, in my opinion, for a thorough investigation of the poverty program in urban communities and elsewhere.

Mr. President, I have discussed certain aspects of the war on poverty as we have seen it operate since its beginning. I call attention to the fact that the authorization in title I is in excess of the administration bill in the amount of \$198 million for fiscal year 1968.

However, the Senate is confronted, in the massive bill before us, with a radically new proposal to spend another \$2.5 billion in grants, and \$300 million in loans on a crash program which is estimated to create 500,000 new jobs.

Although I respect the sincerity of the distinguished Senator whose name is associated with it, I believe his multi-billion-dollar proposal is the wrong program and comes at the wrong time.

In its haste, the proposal attacks the wrong horn of the manpower dilemma faced by the country.

There is no shortage of jobs in the United States today. The total work force, as of July 1967, was 82.9 million. The number of unemployed persons was 3.2 million, or 4.1 percent. I think it is important to note that the term "unemployed" as used here can be misleading. For example, persons are considered unemployed who, for an entire week, did not work at all, were able to work and available for work and would have looked for work except that: First, they were waiting to return to a job from which they were laid off, or second, waiting to report to a new wage or salary job scheduled to start within the following 30 days—and were not in school during the week, or third, believed no work to be available in their line of work or in the community. Moreover, persons under AFDCUP and working in work experience programs are primarily counted as unemployed.

Agricultural workers and construction workers are counted among the unemployed if they have registered as seeking employment. Others unemployed and not seeking work cannot be counted.

Thousands on thousands of good high-paying jobs are going begging every day in every city in every State simply because there are not enough trained or qualified people to fill them and, in some instances, because there are people who do not want to work.

I am advised that, at the end of July, there were, for example, over 343,000 unfilled job openings listed at over 2,000 State public employment offices across the country. These job openings were in 150 major employment areas.

Now, why do we not concentrate on filling those job openings, before we create another half million?

In fact, the 343,000 job openings tell us only part of the job vacancy story.

The total figure on job vacancies—listed and unlisted—is probably closer to the million mark, because information is not available as to the number of job openings nationwide. But this is only part of the story. In many areas of the country, Federal job training openings are going begging as well. In fact, as of last July 31, there were nearly 50,000 MDTA unfilled openings in these programs in the Nation's 48 largest cities.

Is the Congress seriously supposed to authorize the creation of half a million new jobs when one million jobs have no takers and 50,000 training opportunities are being ignored?

The second major defect in the proposal is that it would certainly result in a number of cities quickly creating jobs—jobs they do not need, jobs they do not want, but jobs which will be produced simply because Uncle Sam is footing the bill with hundreds of millions in ready cash.

The kinds of jobs cities will create, for the most part, will be pseudo-jobs. They will be makework jobs, shadow jobs, deadend jobs. They will be manual or unskilled jobs which require little, if any, training. They will be under-skilled jobs with no future, with no possible development, with no real base upon which a human being may build a career.

Such jobs will have the effect of further isolating the poor person from society. He will not only be poor; he will also have a poor man's job. This is exactly the kind of situation which we should all be trying to reverse today. We should try to break the cycle of poverty, not freeze poverty into job categories.

The 1967 Manpower Report of the President stated clearly the kinds of jobs our economy must fill if it is to continue the seven unprecedented years of prosperity the country has enjoyed.

The Manpower Report stated:

At the end of 1966, the most widespread shortages existed for industrial production workers . . . machinists, machine operators, tool makers, aircraft mechanics, model and pattern makers, assemblers, electricians and welders, and for engineers, draftsmen, mathematicians and health service workers.

I do not care how crashing a crash program is, or how many billions may be poured into it; it is not possible to create skilled, trained, and qualified workers for such jobs overnight. No amount of money will turn an under-educated, unskilled, unmotivated ghetto dweller into a skilled employee by providing him with a 1- or 2-year leaf-raking assignment.

You must train and prepare those who will man and guide the American economic system of tomorrow.

And that leads me to the third major defect in the emergency proposal.

What 3 million unemployed in our country need today is not just a job—but a job with a bright future.

The unemployed need education for a job. They need to be taught how to hold

a job; how to perform under varying job conditions; how to shift to a new and perhaps more promising occupation when new opportunity arises.

And if we look at the record of the Congress and the administration these last few years, we will find that there already exists a comprehensive series of opportunity programs which, if they are properly administered, can serve as blueprints for the social and economic rehabilitation of millions of poor people.

The administration's opportunity programs are basically geared and intended to raise people to the level where they can become productive Americans, rather than dependent Americans.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, for example, is a good illustration of the kind of program which invests in human beings by training or retraining people for better jobs. Since it was inaugurated, almost one million men and women have received job training with Federal help. In the past the MDTA program has focused more and more on the disadvantaged, with positive and fruitful results.

This is the type of program we should be improving, rather than setting up parallel or conflicting programs.

Let us not launch new programs until we have corrected the flaws in the old ones, and as I have already stated, there is much work to be done in correcting the existing programs.

My fourth major objection to title II of the bill is that it is clearly inflationary—and that is another thing we do not need in our present state of economic affairs.

Almost \$3 billion poured into 500,000 jobs of very slight productivity is either going to give us a solid dose of new inflation or force the President and the Congress to raise taxes even higher than now proposed.

The total national debt at the end of fiscal year 1967 was \$326 billion. According to the testimony of the Director of the Budget and the Secretary of the Treasury before the House Ways and Means Committee, the anticipated deficit for fiscal year 1968 may go as high as \$29 billion. I do not believe that it is wise to compound this dangerous deficit with an additional \$1.3 billion required, by title II of the bill before us, for fiscal year 1968. This is in excess of the administration's request, and if it stays in the bill, the bill will never reach the President's desk for his signature, considering the temper of the other body.

At a time when the President is requesting the enactment of legislation providing for a surtax on personal and corporation incomes, it would be a serious mistake to launch this new and costly program.

My fifth objection to title II is that it is extraordinarily vague, ambiguous, and unclear. Such a new and costly program as would be envisioned by title II should have the most thorough study and should involve the most careful and detailed analysis before enactment. Exhaustive hearings would be required. Even if we were living in a time when such a crash emergency program were needed, in my judgment, the concepts

and outlines of such a program would have to be much more concrete, more carefully evaluated, studied, and delineated than is the case here.

As Senators DOMINICK and FANNIN stated in their supplemental views on the bill:

Title II was reported to the Floor without hearings.

Senator MURPHY, in his supplemental views stated, with regard to title II:

Here again we seem to be faced with a lack of planning, a lack of definition, a lack of guidelines, and an absence of complete preparation. In good conscience, I cannot agree to spending \$2.8 billion of taxpayers' dollars on such a program.

Senator GRIFFIN, in his supplemental views, referred to title II as "an unfortunate example of hasty, unsound congressional reaction to the riots." He said:

It is as extravagant in its promise as it is vague in its operation. The committee has had no real opportunity to consider the proposal in depth. The record contains no statement of the administration's views regarding the merits of the program, its effect on the poverty war or on the budget. How such a program would relate to ongoing job creation and training programs has not been explored. . . . Instead of holding hearings, the subcommittee released a booklet entitled "Emergency Employment Act—Background Materials." The booklet is supposed to establish the need for title II. In fact, however, the material also emphasizes that superficial, short-term make-work programs do not solve long-term unemployment problems, and that efforts should be directed toward training and education. As written, the title would constitute a virtual abdication of congressional responsibility; it would delegate almost unlimited authority and discretion to the Secretary of Labor.

Finally, there are some real basic philosophical questions we have got to ask ourselves about such a program as would be inaugurated by title II. Is the country ready to give a permanent job to anyone who cannot or will not find work elsewhere?

Once we get people into a program such as this, how do we get them out into productive employment?

Will we ever get them out?

Would we not create a new public welfare bureaucracy?

We will be paying people, essentially for doing nothing productive. They will become an added, and possibly, permanent public burden.

Title II would authorize an expenditure of \$1 billion in grants in fiscal year 1968 and \$1.5 billion in fiscal year 1969. If past experience is worth anything, every Senator knows that these programs mushroom like the prophet's gourd overnight. Two years hence we could expect the Congress to be asked for an expanded program—one which would perhaps double that which is envisioned in title II. If this country were in the midst of a depression, a crash program of this kind might be justified. One thing is abundantly clear. The sense of the Congress and the Nation today is that this program is not necessary and not wise.

I urge the Senate to take action to delete this title from the bill.

Mr. President, I have not addressed my remarks to the pending Prouty amendment; but if the Prouty amendment is agreed to, then the motion which I have offered, the effect of which would be to delete title II, would be out of the question, because the question would then recur on my motion as amended by Senator PROUTY's substitute. My motion would no longer be amendable.

Therefore, I hope Senators will support me in voting against the Prouty amendment and against all other amendments to my motion, so that we can have a final, clear-cut vote on my motion to recommit with instructions to delete title II in its entirety.

EXHIBIT A

[From U.S. News & World Report]

IS UNITED STATES REALLY FILLED WITH POVERTY?—A LOOK AT THE FACTS

(NOTE.—How many Americans are really in poverty? Thirty million? Eighty million? Or only a handful? This article, written for "U.S. News & World Report," is based on a study of poverty—and of the "poverty cult" that has developed in this era.)

(By John B. Parrish, professor of economics, University of Illinois)

When future historians write the history of the 1960s, there will be no more extraordinary episode in their accounts than the rise of America's "new poverty" cult. Intellectuals from every social-science discipline, every religious denomination, every political and social institution have climbed aboard the poverty bandwagon.

This article is concerned with a few fundamental questions: How did the new cult get started? What are its claims? Does the economic evidence support the claims? Are we moving toward a new and better social order or toward social chaos?

After a decade of exploring every nook and cranny of the poverty world, the "new poverty" cult has settled on a few basic doctrines which together form a dogma that apparently must be accepted on faith. These claims may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The economic process, which in earlier years brought affluence to a majority of Americans, recently has slowed up and apparently stopped. As a result, a large minority of Americans are "hopelessly" trapped below the poverty line.

2. The size of this poverty population is "massive," and may be increasing. Minimum estimates place the number at 30 million, maximum at nearly 80 million.

3. Despite its great size, the poverty population is hidden away—"invisible," unknown, unwanted, unaided, helpless.

4. The hard core of the "other America" is the Negro. Because of racial discrimination, he has been unable to participate in economic progress. He is frustrated, embittered, forced to live outside the affluent society of the majority.

5. The "new poverty" can only be eradicated by massive, federal social-action programs involving income maintenance, self-help, education and training, in a milieu of racial integration, the latter voluntary if possible, compulsory if necessary.

Does the evidence on diffusion of economic well-being support the "new poverty" cult? Has diffusion mysteriously slowed to a halt, leaving millions "hopelessly trapped"? Are 30 to 80 million suffering acute deprivation in today's America? The plain truth is there is no basis in fact for the "new poverty" thesis. The high priests of the poverty religion have been exchanging each other's mis-

formation. Let's look briefly at some illustrative evidence.

Diet. The diet of U.S. families has continued to improve steadily over time until today at least 95 per cent, perhaps 96 per cent or 97 per cent of all families have an adequate minimum daily intake of nutrients.

Automatic cooking equipment. Are 20 per cent, perhaps 40 per cent of U.S. families without decent equipment with which to prepare this food intake? No. As a matter of fact, 99 per cent of all U.S. households have automatic cooking equipment, including most of those families living in rural and urban "ghettos." The diffusion has been consistent and persistent over the last six decades.

Refrigeration. Could it be that millions of American families are experiencing dull and dreary meals because they have no way to preserve foods and beverages against spoilage? No. About 99 per cent of all U.S. families have purchased electric or gas refrigerators. It is reasonable to assume that they know how to operate them, even in the "ghettos."

Communication. Are millions of America's poor shut off from all contact with the rest of their affluent countrymen—alone, frustrated, in that "other world" of poverty isolation? At last count, the diffusion of TV sets had reached 92 per cent of all U.S. households, providing instant access to entertainment, news, sports, cultural enrichment. Since a small per cent of middle, and upper-income families who can afford TV have chosen not to buy, the per cent of families having TV who want it must be around 96 or 97 per cent—a diffusion achieved in just 15 years.

Medical aid. Have the "new hopeless poor" found the doors to modern medical service "slammed shut," forcing them to rely on quack remedies, superstition, midwives, or to die alone and unattended?

In 1910, only one of every 10 American families had access to hospitals for childbirth. The diffusion since then has been spectacular and persistent for all groups, including nonwhites. By 1960, over 97 per cent of all American women had their babies born in hospitals. Today it is somewhere between 98 per cent and 99 per cent.

The luxury of telephone service. Telephone service is ordinarily not a rock-bottom consumer necessity. It is useful and convenient but not an absolute requirement, as was demonstrated during the Great Depression of the 1930s when the percent of families with telephones declined.

Yet today nearly 90 per cent of all U.S. households have telephones. Since there are still a few pockets of unavailability, it is reasonable to conclude that close to 95 per cent of all U.S. households in availability areas who would like this luxury actually enjoy it.

Some clues to how much poverty in United States

Percentage of families having—	1920	1965
Minimum adequate diet, or better	50	95
Electric or gas stoves	28	99
Electric refrigerators	1	99
Television sets	0	92
Telephones in home	35	188
Children born in hospitals	20	98

¹ In metropolitan areas.

Source: Study by Prof. John B. Parrish, University of Illinois.

THREE POVERTY FALLACIES

The foregoing illustrative evidence raises an interesting question: *How can the "massive" group of America's "hopeless poor" buy so much with so little?* Perhaps this basic question can be put another way: How could the poverty intellectuals be so wrong? The

answer is actually very simple. The intellectuals have chosen to be wrong. Most members of the "new poverty" cult are quite well-trained in statistics. Some are acknowledged experts. They know better. But, for the sake of the "new poverty" religion, they have chosen to accept three poverty fallacies.

The "new poverty" cult has built much of its case on family-income statistics. Some technical matters aside, there is nothing wrong with these statistics, *per se*. But there is something wrong, very much wrong, with their use. It is impossible for anyone adequately to interpret them in terms of average family economic well-being.

Poverty fallacy No. 1 got its big push from the 1964 report on "The Problem of Poverty in America" by the Council of Economic Advisers. CEA determined that households with less than \$3,000 annual income were in poverty. Using this income yardstick, it was determined that 20 per cent of U.S. households containing 30 million persons were in the poverty class.

This report provided a wonderful takeoff point for poverty statisticians. With 30 million to build on, it was not difficult to find millions of additional families who should be added to the poverty population. The poverty numbers game became quite exciting. Who could count the most? Honors so far have gone to those claiming nearly 80 million. A majority of cult members have settled for a more modest 40 to 50 million.

The truth about poverty-income statistics is this: Under no reasonable assumptions does income below \$3,000 indicate poverty status. It may or may not, and to say otherwise is not only erroneous but absurd.

Let's take as an example a young married couple, the Smiths. They are attending college. They constitute a statistical household. Their annual income is \$1,500 a year. They are not being "hopelessly" shut out from the good things of life. They are, along with other American youth enjoying a rate of access to higher education greater than the youth of any country, any time, any place. They enjoy electric lighting, refrigeration, adequate if not fancy food, and a second-hand automobile or motorcycle. They would like a new Cadillac, but will manage without one. They aren't "poor" and need no crocodile tears shed in their behalf.

At the other end of the life cycle are the Joneses. Mr. Jones has been a machinist all his life. He and Mrs. Jones had always wanted to visit the country's great national parks after the children had grown up and left. So he has opted to retire at age 60. The retirement income will come to only \$2,000 a year. Are they poor? The poverty cult says, "Yes," these people are suffering from deprivation. They have been "hopelessly" cast aside. Yet the truth is they have a small home paid for, a modest automobile paid for. They enjoy refrigeration, automatic cooking equipment, inside plumbing, TV, enough clothes to last for years—the accumulation of a lifetime. And now they propose to enjoy more leisure, in more comfort, for more years than similar working-class families of any country, any time. The Joneses think the Council of Economic Advisers is statistically wacky.

And take the Browns. They are in the middle years. Both Mr. and Mrs. Brown work. Their three children are in school. They have a modest new home, partially paid for, some savings, some insurance, good clothes—yes, and a paid-for refrigerator and TV set. They have a new car and six installments still outstanding. Mr. Brown becomes ill. Mrs. Brown quits work to take care of him. Their income drops to below \$3,000 for the year. Are they in trouble? Yes. Are they in desperate consumer poverty? Are they "hopelessly trapped?" By no means. After a tough year they will resume as members of the affluent society even by CEA's definition.

ECONOMIC WELL-BEING: "CUMULATIVE"

These illustrations could be multiplied many times. Cross-section household-income statistics are a very inappropriate yardstick with which to measure economic well-being, which is a longitudinal and cumulative process.

Let's return for a moment to the telephone as a luxury—or at least a semiluxury—consumer good. Now take the desperately poor on whom the doors of affluency have presumably been "slammed shut." Now take the "poorest of the poor"—those at the very rock bottom of the income scale, those desperately deprived households earning less than \$500 a year. You just can't get much poorer than that.

Now observe that nearly 60 per cent of these poorest of the poor had telephone service in 1965. How could this be? Why would families presumably facing the grim miseries of malnutrition order telephone service? And, if we make allowance for the availability factor and the "can afford but don't want" factor, then it is reasonable to conclude that 70 to 80 per cent of America's poorest poor had telephones in 1965.

If this is the "new poverty," it is apparently not too severe. How to explain this paradox of income poverty, consumer-goods affluence? The answer is quite simple. Income data are a very bad measure of economic well-being. The Smiths, the Joneses, the Browns, all had telephone service even though the CEA's income statistics put them in the "poverty class."

There is a second big fallacy in the "new poverty" claims, and in some respects an inexcusable one. The poverty cult measures the economic well-being of families at all income levels by determining what they can buy with their income at current retail prices. In fact, the poverty cult makes much out of the fact that because of the greed of retail merchants and the gullibility and lack of buying savvy on the part of many poor buyers, the "new poor" actually pay more for the same goods than the affluent classes. This is hogwash.

The truth is, America's low-income classes have access to a low-price consumer-goods market in which prices are a fraction of published retail prices, and in which the purchasing power of "poor" dollars is multiplied many times. This discount market yields levels of consumption far above that indicated by retail prices.

As the poor could explain to CEA and the poverty intellectuals, this market is America's enormously big resale market—the world's largest. Every year, from 25 to 65 per cent of many consumer durable-goods purchases involve second or third-hand goods moving in established trade or in informal, person-to-person channels.

Take as an example a popular consumer durable good, the electric refrigerator. In 1923, this appliance was a new item. In current dollars, it cost around \$900. Its capacity was small, averaging less than 6 cubic feet. It averaged only six years of service life, or about \$150 a year. There were too few produced, and service was too short for a resale market. Only the rich could afford a refrigerator.

Today a good new refrigerator can be purchased for about \$300. Its capacity will average about 10 cubic feet. Service life will be around 18 years. The average replacement year currently is around 10. So the first buyer pays about \$30 a year, minus trade-in. Resale value will be about \$50. This will permit the second buyer to purchase eight years of the same quality of refrigeration for about \$6 a year. The low-income buyer, not particular about the latest style, has expanded his purchasing power 500 per cent over that of the first high-income buyer.

Today's low-income, "new poverty" buyer has purchasing power 25 times greater than

that of the rich buyer of 1923. America's consumer durable-goods market is operating under a law of accelerating diffusion. America's low-income families are not being shut out. They are being pulled into affluence at an ever-increasing rate.

There is a big, hidden, tertiary consumer-goods market not measured even by retail or resale price statistics. This is the inter-generation movement of goods accumulated over time and handed down or distributed from one generation to another. In an affluent society this becomes a very large market. Sewing machines, automobiles, electric irons, kitchenware, furniture, silverware, dinnerware, bicycles, etc.—all these provide an enormous source of consumption for all income classes, including the poor.

GROWTH OF NO-COST GOODS, SERVICES

If ignoring the durable-goods resale market is inexcusable, the failure of the poverty cult to take account of the rapid growth in low-cost or no-cost goods and services in America is well-nigh incredible. It is incredible because much of it has been brought about by the very federal agencies whose economists have been among the high priests of the poverty cult. This failure constitutes poverty fallacy No. 3.

To illustrate: Nearly 90 per cent of all Negro births today are in hospitals. Yet the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor in 1964 said half the Negroes in America were suffering from acute poverty, measured by income statistics. How can so many poor afford so much medical service? For two reasons: First, as already noted, the income data are faulty. But more to the point here, almost every urban community has free or very low-cost medical services for low-income families. In fact, surveys show that in some communities the lowest-income families have more medical checkups, vaccinations, chest X rays, eye examinations than some higher-income groups.

The number of low-cost food programs has been growing rapidly. For example, the national school-lunch program provided low-cost noon meals for nearly 20 million children in 1967. The food-stamp plan provided low-cost food for 1 million persons in 1966, and was scheduled to rise to 2 million in 1967. The low-cost milk plan—along with school lunch—accounted for 5 per cent of total U.S. nonfarm fluid-milk consumption in 1966, and would have expanded even more in 1967 had not cutbacks been ordered because of Vietnam.

The total number of low-income persons reached by various food-subsidy programs came to nearly 30 million in 1966, or precisely the number of persons classified as poor in 1964 by the Council of Economic Advisers. Since many of CEA's 30 million didn't belong in the poverty classification in the first place, some questions may well be raised as to who and how many poor have been "forgotten."

If the evidence suggests the "new poverty" intellectuals have grossly exaggerated the extent of poverty in America, can we now sit back comfortably and forget the poverty claims? Unfortunately, we cannot.

SOME DISTURBING TRENDS

There are some very disturbing social trends which have accompanied the spread of affluency. Even more disturbing is the possibility that the federal antipoverty programs may be causally as well as associational related to these developments. We may be headed not toward a great new society, but toward social chaos. Let's look briefly at six problem areas, all of them interrelated:

1. The various federal-State income-maintenance programs seem to have generated an explosion of illegitimacy in America that will have far-reaching consequences for the future. The illegitimacy rate has doubled in the last few years, until today 1 out of 12 Americans is born illegitimate. At recent

rates of growth, very tenth American by the early 1970's will be born out of wedlock.

2. Related to illegitimacy is the long-run growth in households managed only by females, a large proportion subsidized by various federal-State aid programs. Today in America, 1 out of 10 households is fatherless. There is every reason to expect this to rise in the future. Among Negro families the percentage is already 1 out of 4.

3. A particularly disconcerting development over and above trends for the whole population is the upsurge in the number and proportion of unwanted and unguided Negro youth. Today 1 out of 4 Negroes is born illegitimate. In some sections of large urban areas the percentage is very much higher. If the trends of 1950-64 continue, then by 1975 about one third of all Negro youth born in the U.S. will be born outside normal family-life patterns. They will be arriving at the teen ages not suffering from malnutrition or abject consumer-goods poverty, but from acute social and intellectual poverty. The future consequences for the rest of the urban populations, both white and nonwhite, will be considerable.

4. Related to but not solely derived from problems 1 to 3 is the rise of juvenile delinquency. The rate has doubled in the last decade. How long can society tolerate such a rate of growth? At least in part, the steady climb of delinquency may be due not to poverty, but to an affluent society—more leisure, more spending money, fewer responsibilities, less motivation, failure of rehabilitative programs.

5. The diffusion of affluency has been accompanied not only by rising juvenile delinquency but by a rising rate of general crime. The rate rose by one third, 1960 to 1964. The law-abiding segment of the population has an ever-increasing struggle to avoid the depredations of criminals, the latter experiencing not acute deprivation but the encouragement of easy and profitable pickings of the affluent state.

6. Perhaps no problem illustrates so well the failure of the poverty intellectuals than the upward drift of youth unemployment. Very strenuous and dedicated efforts have been made by the U.S. Congress to do something about youth unemployment. A great diversity of programs has been attempted. Recent conditions of tight, full employment have provided a favorable labor market. Yet the "new poverty" intellectuals have only failure to show for their efforts. Youth unemployment has not retreated. For nearly 20 years it has shown a rise—slight for white youth, sharply upward for nonwhite youth.

Could it be the "new poverty" cult has been fighting the wrong war? Measured by consumer-goods yardsticks, less than 5 per cent of U.S. households are below the poverty line, and the percentage continues to decline.

There is a war to be fought, however. There are disturbing signs of deep social problems around us, and more on the horizon. The most rapidly growing segment of the American population is the illegitimate segment. The largest proportion of this "other America" is Negro.

Who is to discipline, guide, train this growing army of unwanted, unmotivated? The ordinary family influences, so strong among earlier ethnic groups immigrating to U. S. cities, appears to be lacking. In fact, such influences appear to be declining and may well be disintegrating.

The churches, historically an important institution in shaping constructive life patterns, appear to have limited and perhaps declining influence.

The "new social problem" is being dumped onto the public schools and the police. But schools cannot discipline—and without discipline they cannot educate.

The police can discipline—but they cannot educate and motivate. Racial-integration

efforts have created new antagonisms to add to the problems of the already overburdened schools and police.

PHONY STATISTICS: HARDLY CONVINCING

The poverty intellectuals say they are building a great new society. Perhaps they are. But phony statistics are hardly convincing proof. Perhaps they should take a second look. They may well be rushing us pell-mell toward social chaos. The dogmas of the poverty cult may not prove as effective as expected.

Efforts to force racial integration may bring about as many disruptive as constructive influences. We may well need some new institutions designed for the problems of an affluent society of the present, not the poverty society of the past.

If this conclusion is even partially correct, then we should be about the task before it is too late. It may be already too late.

EXHIBIT B

IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE IN NORTHSIDE!!

Are you tired of being stepped on?

Are you satisfied with the prevailing conditions in Northside?

Community action can help you!!

Come to the Community action meeting.

Date: Tuesday July 18, 1967.

Time: 7:30 P.M.

Place: Presbyterian Church—North Mercer Street.

PROPOSED AGENDA

Election of officers.

Committee reports.

Recreation center.

Representatives to the Board of Directors.

Fund Raising Projects.

Freedom School . . . and anything else that's on your mind . . .

"United We Stand Divided We Fall."

EXHIBIT C

MORE MONEY—Now!

All across the nation, more and more welfare recipients are now getting more money for their living needs because they are now members of the welfare/rights movement.

How are you doing? Are you getting more? You can get legal help and a voice that counts in getting more welfare money.

Find out! Write, phone, or come in and see us, at your local Welfare Rights Office.

GOALS FOR A NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS MOVEMENT

OUR RIGHTS ARE NOT FOR SALE

We are not willing to sell our rights as American citizens: Our rights to dignity, our rights to justice, our rights to democracy—for the food, clothing, and shelter which our age, our disability, the absence or death of our family's breadwinner, our lack of economic opportunity, our society—have made us unable to provide.

Based on Report of Workshop No. 2, Goals for a National Welfare Rights Movement, First National Welfare Rights Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, August 6 and 7, 1966.

Our goal is: Jobs or income now! Decent jobs with adequate wages for those who can work, adequate income for those who cannot work.

Our goals are:

1. Adequate income: A system which guarantees enough money for all Americans to live dignified lives above the level of poverty.

2. Dignity: A system which guarantees recipients the same full freedoms, rights and respect as all American citizens.

3. Justice: A fair and open system which guarantees recipients the full protections of the Constitution.

4. Democracy: A system which guarantees recipients direct participation in the decisions under which they must live.

IMMEDIATE GOALS

Stopping the illegal practices of welfare departments:

Midnight raids

Other searches and seizures without search warrants

Giving recipients smaller grants than the law says they should be getting

Not giving recipients "special grants" for heavy clothing, household furnishings, etc., which the law says they should get

Illegally cutting people off welfare

Threatening, scaring, or intimidating recipients

Discriminating against families with illegitimate children

Discriminating against large families

Racial discrimination

Forcing recipients to "accept" other "social services" in order to keep their welfare grants

Not informing recipients of their rights of appeal

Making friends or non-legally responsible relatives pay child support

Forcing mothers with young children to take jobs

Forcing recipients to live in segregated or substandard housing

Illegally rejecting applicants for welfare

Recognition of welfare recipient organizations as representatives of welfare recipients . . . including the rights to pass out information at welfare centers and to be with recipients at interviews and fair hearings.

Full budgets and grants based on current cost-of-living . . . in many states grants are based on costs-of-living during the 1950's.

Full budgets and grants for all welfare recipients . . . in many states, recipients receive only a percentage of the state's own grant standards for minimum health and decency.

Getting made public . . . to welfare recipients, their organizations, and anyone who want to know. . .

All the rules, regulations, and policies of welfare departments . . . in many places, although they are "public documents" such information is purposefully kept from welfare recipients and their organizations.

Fair hearings, immediately, with free lawyers, for recipients who believe they have been treated illegally or unfairly by welfare departments . . . most communities do not follow the federal regulations for fair hearings.

Direct representation of welfare recipients' organizations on all welfare policy-making and advisory boards.

Clearer and simplified welfare regulations, policies, and procedures.

OTHER PRESSING GOALS

National (Federal) grant minimums set at or above the Federal poverty line.

Ending "categories" for assistance (such as OAA, AFDC, home relief).

Having only one category for assistance—need.

Welfare grants for all people who have incomes below grant levels—including people who are employed.

Property maximums for welfare eligibility set at equal to one year's income at the Federal poverty line.

Getting rid of "man in the house" and "suitable home" regulations and laws, except as they apply to the whole public.

Court-ordered child support payments for welfare children paid directly to welfare departments, with welfare families getting full, regular grants.

Application for welfare by affidavit (sworn statement that the person applying is eligible) with immediate grants unless or until the person is proved ineligible.

An end to all residency requirements.

Enough money for food, rather than food stamps.

More Federal money for welfare.

Minimum standards for clothing and household furnishings.

Clerical and sub-professional jobs in welfare departments for recipients who are able to and wish to work.

Federal money for "home relief" programs. Getting rid of "special investigation units" in welfare departments.

Ending "relative responsibility" except for parent-for-child.

Allowing all recipients to earn some money without deducting it from their welfare grants.

Ending all liens by welfare departments on welfare recipients' property.

Making all banks cash welfare checks.

Providing child care for welfare mothers who are able to and wish to work.

Providing real job training and actual jobs for recipients who are able to and wish to work.

Emergency public assistance . . . available 24 hours a day.

Dividing public welfare into two completely separate parts:

(1) One agency handling only welfare grants (income assistance . . . a clerical rather than social-work agency.

(2) Another handling all other social services . . . a social work agency handling counseling, guidance, training, etc.

[From *Now!* national welfare leaders newsletter, vol. 1, No. 11]

CONGRESS READIES ANTI-WELFARE LAWS—DEMONSTRATION CALLED FOR NATION'S CAPITOL AUGUST 28

WELFARE RIGHTS NEWS

Cleveland welfare rights movement wins furniture

The basic needs campaign in Cleveland has succeeded in getting the Welfare Department to tell workers to meet all basic needs requests for beds, mattresses-blankets, tables, and chairs, stoves, refrigerators and washing machines.

The Welfare Department also admitted that they had not been "uniform" in meeting requests for these basic needs. The fight to prevent the closing of the Hough office (in the ghetto) continues.

We've got rights!

An excellent summary of the growing legal attack on the welfare system is to be found in Richard A. Cloward's and Frances Fox Piven's latest article in the *New Republic's* August 5, 1967 issue. Reprints are available from the Poverty/Rights Action Center for 25¢—all four Cloward/Piven articles for \$1.00

Four locals now in Utica

The Utica (New York) Welfare Rights Movement now has 4 chapters. Mrs. Annie Mae Goodson is Coordinating Chairman. Mrs. Goodson, Mrs. Beatrice English, James Hooks, and Diana Compolongo head the locals.

Iowa welfare rights now has two active groups. Mrs. Margaret Rees is chairman of the Mothers for Adequate Welfare in Waterloo, and Mrs. Margaret Beechum is chairman of the Progressive Action Club in Muscatine.

GOALS FOR THE NATIONAL WELFARE RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Enclosed in this issue is the statement of goals for the National Welfare Rights Movement, developed at a workshop at the August 1966 national meeting in Chicago.

It will serve as a basic working document for the convention. What changes are needed?

ACTION

Congress must know that if this bill passes it will directly contribute to the crisis in our cities. We must make our voices heard on this anti-welfare bill.

1. Plan to send a bus from your community to join the national demonstration Monday, August 28, in Washington, D.C. against this bill and for jobs and decent income now. (See next page for details.)

2. Write your Congressman today to protest this anti-welfare, anti-poor people bill ("1967 Social Security amendments").

3. Contact church, social worker, civil rights and other liberal groups and especially all grassroots community groups and get them to protest this bill; write their Congressmen, and to join your delegation to Washington, D.C., on August 28.

Now!

The national welfare rights movement invites ghetto and barrio groups from across the country to join in opposing oppressive anti-welfare legislation and to demand jobs and decent income now!

In a Washington, D.C., demonstration, Monday, August 28.

Liberal, labor, church, social work and civil rights groups are also urged to attend.

Groups should plan to arrive in Washington by 10 a.m. and to stay through 5 p.m.

Lobbying visits to Congressmen will be scheduled in the morning as well as meetings with OEO, Labor, HEW, HUD, and other officials. The demonstration and rally will be held in the afternoon.

For additional information contact; Poverty/Rights Action Center, 1713 R Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20009.

More money now!

NATIONAL CONVENTION AUGUST 25 TO 28

These dates are definite—disregard earlier dates:

The First National Welfare Rights Movement Convention will be held in Washington, D.C., August 25 to 28.

See Newsletter #15 for the Convention Call and full details.

Each welfare rights group has received a pre-registration form for its delegates.

Delegates will be based on *paid up* members. Both the money and the national record cards for members must be turned in to count toward delegates. Groups should have their membership money and national record cards in to national headquarters as soon as possible. Membership money and national record cards will be accepted at the convention but this may delay seating of some of those delegates.

Delegates will be sent details of registration, maps showing the convention location, and information on how and where to register in Washington. Groups should return the yellow pre-registration form with the names of their delegates as soon as possible.

Any welfare recipients or organizers who wish to attend the convention as *observers* should notify national headquarters immediately as space will be limited.

All group members and supporters are urged to plan to come to Washington on Monday, August 28, for the national demonstration on jobs and decent income.

Call national headquarters *today* if you have questions!

CONGRESS READIES ANTI-WELFARE LAWS

The House Ways and Means Committee this week announced its proposals on welfare. They proposed that:

All states be required to set up Work and Training Programs for welfare recipients.

Every welfare recipient over 16 years of age who is determined able be required to participate in work or training or be cut off welfare. This would include mothers.

Instead of providing more money for children in their own homes, more money would be provided for children placed in foster homes, states establish more programs for investigating "neglect and abuse of children" with more "child welfare works" to remove children from their own homes.

States not receive federal money for more children than are presently on the rolls—welfare rolls would be frozen at present levels.

The Committee did *not* include the Administration proposal that all states be required to meet 100% of their own standard of need. It also did *not* require states to aid

families with dependent children when a parent is unemployed (AFDC-UP).

These proposals are a direct attack on poor people. This bill would continue to use welfare as a weapon to divide families and now try to force mothers to work whether or not this is in the best interest of their children.

Instead of providing for real jobs it proposes more WET training—which a majority of the time does not lead to jobs. And now it seems that once "trained", people will be cut off welfare—whether or not they are able to find work.

WELFARE RIGHTS NEWS

Pittsfield, Mass., PAPA W marches

Mrs. Barbara Bragdon, President of PAPA W (Pittsfield Association of Parents for Adequate Welfare) reports that her group is continuing to press for fair hearings even though some people have been denied hearings.

The PAPA W protest on June 30 was described as the "most militant act ever staged by Pittsfield welfare recipients." PAPA W got friendly support from the Mayor but there has been little action on their 16 demands for changes in welfare department procedures.

Mrs. Bragdon, mother of 7, will lead the PAPA W delegation to the national convention.

Lancaster, Pa.

The Citizens Welfare Group led by Mrs. Charlotte Stewart, Chairman, picketing the County Board of Public Assistance on June 30, got the County Welfare Director to admit publicly "we aren't paying the minimum standards of health and decency. The state doesn't have the money."

Louisville welfare organization elects officers

The Louisville Welfare Organization has elected Mrs. Mae Belle Potter, President. Mrs. Potter, 30, mother of 6 children, says she joined the welfare rights movement "to get the benefits we are entitled to." Her first act as president was to telephone the Kentucky State Welfare Director to press for changes in state policy as demanded by Kentucky Welfare Rights groups on June 30.

The group plans a dance August 15 to raise money to send their delegates to the convention.

Wiley to speak at national Catholic conference

George Wiley will speak on "The Equal Rights of the Poor" at the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice in Kansas City, Aug. 17-20.

EXHIBIT D

OFFICE OF ECONOMY OPPORTUNITY,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. HULETT SMITH,
Governor of West Virginia,
Charleston, W. Va.

DEAR GOVERNOR SMITH: As you know, OEO, at your request and in cooperation with your offices, has been conducting an investigation of the following charges cited in your letter of August 14, 1967, to Sargent Shriver:

1. Babcock State Park disturbance.
 2. Alleged immoral conduct in Wyoming County
 3. Misuse of GSA vehicles
 4. Nicholas County controversy
 5. Effects of sedition arrests in Kentucky
- Briefly, our investigation found the following:

1. The Volunteers at Babcock State Park, while not nearly as inconsiderate as first noted, did indeed disturb neighboring cabins on the night of July 22.

The charges of tampering with vehicles and of destroying park property were found to be invalid. However, there seems to be no question the Volunteers who stayed at the park did disturb some people using the park. We feel the Babcock State Park incident

might have been avoided with better planning and supervision on the part of the Appalachian Volunteers and with better notification of State Park officials of the exact nature and duration of the conference held there. The fact is that apparently no planning concerning the possibility of rain took place and Volunteers had to make their own arrangements in the midst of the sudden downpour. By copy of this letter, we are relating our concern to Mr. Milton Ogle, Director of the Appalachian Volunteers.

We regret that this incident took place and will work closely with the Appalachian Volunteers and your office to insure that similar incidents do not reoccur in the future.

2. We found no verification for the charges of immoral conduct by VISTAs or Appalachian Volunteers in Wyoming County or any of the other counties in which VISTA and the Appalachian Volunteers worked in West Virginia. You should know, however, that there are rumors of immorality in Wyoming County and that, while untrue, may continue to disturb the program of the Appalachian Volunteers. This means that the Appalachian Volunteers should make even greater efforts to maintain high standards of conduct in the communities where they are working. A total of 21 people were interviewed in Wyoming County and were unable to provide any concrete evidence for the charges. We feel that increased supervision this summer by Appalachian Volunteer staff has led to more satisfactory behavior by the Volunteers.

3. The charge of misuse of a government vehicle by a VISTA Volunteer was found to be true. A VISTA Volunteer drove the vehicle with a friend to Charleston, West Virginia, for social purposes.

Since this is an inappropriate use of a government vehicle, we have transferred the car from her use and will not make a GSA vehicle available to her in the future. Any Volunteer found to be misusing a government vehicle will have GSA vehicles removed from his use as a minimal action taken by VISTA in the future.

4. The charges of Appalachian Volunteer Summer Associates in Nicholas County calling for the "mass dismissal of a number of the county's elected officials and school personnel" were unfounded. We feel that the Appalachian Volunteer-VISTA group conducted itself well within the bounds required by OEO. The OEO investigation did find that a number of citizens of this county have opposed the policies of the school principal in question for several years, thus predating both CAP and VISTA programs. Because of their interest in tutoring and other education-related matters, VISTA Volunteers did work with people who had doubts about school policy.

5. As you know, a panel of three Federal Judges has recently ruled unconstitutional the sedition law under which an Appalachian Volunteer fieldman was indicted.

Because of the current misunderstanding about the Appalachian Volunteers and the need for closer coordination and administrative tightening, we are increasing our staff in West Virginia. A new staff member, Miss Denise Cavanaugh, will work full time in the state and an additional staff person will be added to work part time in coordinating with the Appalachian Volunteers in West Virginia. Mr. Richard Dodds will continue to have overall responsibility for the state and will continue to work closely with the State OEO Technical Assistance Director, Mr. Jeff Monroe, and his staff.

While the Appalachian Volunteers were found to have violated no major or minor OEO regulations, they can be criticized for incomplete planning. Therefore, we do think it essential that the Appalachian Volunteers show an increased awareness of the need to communicate to the general public the na-

ture of the program, especially since the general public has heard principally the charges and none of the positive aspects of the group's efforts, and of the need to take appropriate steps to insure that the incidents which did occur will not happen again. For example, I think the need for an intensive Volunteer orientation to the area (and this holds true for Volunteers across the country) has been underscored during the events of the past several weeks and we will require that such an orientation is a part of the training for every Volunteer who serves in West Virginia. We are grateful for your offer to provide staff to participate in this aspect of the training and we intend to take immediate advantage of it. For example, this week members of the West Virginia Department of Mental Health are in Kansas training and selecting VISTA Volunteers who will serve in the highly successful West Virginia Mental Health project.

To further implement the training suggestion and others, I have directed our mid-Atlantic Regional Administrator to work with Mr. Monroe and the Appalachian Volunteer staff to set up regular, periodic meetings to review program progress and potential problem areas.

VISTA has held the Appalachian Volunteer program in high regard and will make every effort to insure that the program is maintained at a professional level. We are glad that you have not let a few incidents influence your judgment about the program, and we are grateful for your support, both now and in the past, for overall VISTA efforts in West Virginia.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. CROOK,
Director, VISTA.

INTERIM RESULTS OF THE OEO INVESTIGATION INTO COMPLAINTS MADE AGAINST APPALACHIAN VOLUNTEERS AND VISTA VOLUNTEERS IN WEST VIRGINIA

This is an interim statement containing the results of the OEO investigation into a series of complaints made against the VISTA and Appalachian Volunteers (AVs) program over the past summer. A complete investigation on all significant complaints is in the process of being completed. This statement contains the present status of the investigation with respect to four of the complaints contained in the letter from Governor Hulett Smith of August 14 to the Director of OEO.

Charges and details (The charges are quoted from the governor's letter.)

1. *Charge:* "A group of persons identified as AVs and VISTA personnel staged a riotous all night party on July 22 at Babcock State Park—destroying park property, interfering with the exit and entrance of other park guests, tampering with automobiles and generally disturbing the peace. Several of these persons used Federal government automobiles, raising the possible question of misuse of U.S. Government property (as well as being abominable public relations for the national administration)."

Details: On Saturday, July 22, an AV training program involving 89 people in an overnight camp-out at Babcock State Park was rained out at about 11:00 p.m. The majority of the campers, none of whom had tents, left the park and returned to their communities. About a dozen stayed in the park at one of two park cabins rented for the night by an AFL-CIO training officer. Five others stayed at the second cabin. The cabin where the twelve stayed was located some 40 yards from two occupied cabins. The people in these cabins complained to the Park Superintendent that a wild party was held late into the night. The AV's in the cabin contend that there was much loud discussion, but not a real party.

The purpose of the AV gathering was to hold a mid-summer 'conference-training-discussion session. This was done with the

approval of VISTA. This removes the question of misuse of the GSA cars.

There was little preparation for the event. An AV staffer, went to the park and got general information about a week before, but gave the park no notice of the AV plans. Despite this, the arrival of the almost 90 members of the AV session were assimilated into the camp with a minimum disturbance and the group finally settled in the evening in an overflow camp site across the highway and behind a clump of trees from other campers. The park superintendent, says when he made his 10:00 P.M. rounds everything was all right. Then it rained.

The disturbance could not be called riotous although noisy and probably inconsiderate; there was no property damage attributed to the AVs by the park superintendent. One park guest told the superintendent that his distributor wire was cut during the night but the superintendent said he had no basis but guess work to tie this to the AVs—the man's cabin was at a location away from the AV disturbances. The other charges in the letter about tampering with cars were according to the superintendent, instances where people heard a group near their car and were afraid something might be done to it.

One of the people staying in the two neighboring cabins, says she spent a sleepless night and thought the AVs must have had an "unsupervised ball" until about 3:30 A.M. She says there was loud singing with guitars and banging of doors. She thinks there was a lot of drinking, but says she saw no bottles. She says her husband did not ask them to be quiet because they were afraid they might be attacked—this was also the reason they didn't try to go for help in their car. Although the two ends of the loop drive past their cabin were sometimes blocked with about four different cars, she remembers they were not blocked during all of the party.

The family had planned to leave the next morning for home, but delayed their trip until the following day so they could get a good night's rest.

The lady says, "We can go anywhere and get this kind of behavior—we went to the park to get away from it." She adds that the AVs were crummy-looking—she noted particularly that one girl had sores on her legs which she attributed to being dirty. She says that some were all right and that she didn't see them until the morning after the incident when they had been caught in the rain.

One camper left the park in the afternoon because of the AVs who had first attempted to fit into four six-man camp sites (24 total) in the main camping area. His reasons as given by the park superintendent were that his site was a path-way between areas rented by the AVs. One AV staffer says he told them that he objected to their beer drinking. The AV's say they were told by park officials that they could drink the beer. The provisions for the group brought three cases of beer and three cases of soft drink. They were told to move to the over-flow area because of their numbers. They agreed to do so with approval of an unidentified park ranger after dinner so they could use the stoves on the camp sites—none were available on the over-flow site. The superintendent was not asked directly if he gave permission for beer drinking but he knew of the beer drinking in the afternoon and made no effort to restrict it.

With respect to the other charges in the letter from Superintendent, he says cabin guest did not actually have his car tampered with, but said the AVs were "messing around" and was apparently afraid they might tamper with it. Another report from a person described in the letter, "a lodge guest" was from a temporary park employee who was afraid the noise outside might endanger his state truck; this man, however, did not notify the superintendent.

It seems likely that much of the disturbances reported by other guests was a result

of AV campers and possibly other campers looking for a place out of the rain—the lodge would be a logical place to look as well as the two cabins rented by the AFL-CIO Training Officer, one of which is in the far corner of the park and probably was not found. This explanation was considered possible by the park superintendent.

2. *Charge:* "Reports from Wyoming County, West Virginia, indicate confidence in, and effectiveness of, the VISTA-AV program has been seriously weakened by immoral conduct on the part of several of these volunteers. While these persons logically argue that their personal lives are their own affair, the fact remains that promiscuity, particularly when it crosses racial lines, is not accepted by the community as a whole and damages public respect and support for the VISTA and AV program."

The key source on AV immorality in Wyoming County, a neighbor of the former office-apartment of the AVs on Broadway Street in Mullens did not articulate much detail about the AV misconduct. He said that he saw some kissing. The only example of this was an incident outside the AV office when he said some guy lined up a whole lot of girls and went down the line kissing them. The often repeated complaint is that a group of boys and girls stayed overnight on occasion sleeping on the floor in sleeping bags. This source says, "They were staying in there together, but I couldn't say if they stayed overnight. I would see them in the morning."

One VISTA who lives in the apartment says that on two occasions groups stayed overnight. The first time was after a big cookout organized at Herndon Heights. About 15 AVs stayed overnight on the floor in sleeping bags of the office rather than drive home later at night. The next time four stayed after getting to Mullens late from Beckley July 23 where they attended a local pageant called "Honey in the Rock." These groups included boys and girls, but no Negroes were included.

A boyfriend of one VISTA girl stayed overnight about twice, but the VISTA Volunteer slept in the bedroom with her roommate and the boyfriend slept in the next room.

She moved out of the apartment on Broadway after she learned that she was in physical danger; the storefront windows on the building were broken by vandals. She moved temporarily to Brenton where two AV girls have a trailer.

The two remaining neighbors of the AV apartment which is the subject of complaint were contacted. One said that his only objection was "just the looks of the outfit—as dirty looking as a damn sewer. I haven't seen anything take place. I could hear them some but they didn't bother me. I was afraid they'd agitate the colored. They went up to a colored restaurant in Goose Hollow to get meals sometimes. The better class of white people didn't mess with them."

A second neighbor says he thought nothing of the AVs as neighbors except they were a little dirty. He said he would be sound asleep by 11:00 p.m. every night.

One of the VISTAs lived in another apartment before moving to the Broadway address. She left before she was asked to leave, but her landlord said he had complaints from neighbors that she was noisy late at night. He would have asked her to leave if she had not done so. A local official who looked into the matter said he found that the VISTA had been loud on occasion (she admits playing her phonograph at night) and at one point had a loud party. The official says such parties happen often in most neighborhoods—he said it was basically innocent, the kind of party he would have enjoyed. The former landlord, however, complains that the VISTA also damaged some property such as removing doors from bookcases, a kitchenette broke down and some chairs were damaged.

The landlord also complained that he had to repaint the apartment. He says he observed none of her behavior while the VISTA was his tenant and got no complaints except about noise.

A total of 21 residents of Wyoming County were interviewed concerning AV activities; none had more specific information about immorality than covered above.

3. *Charge:* "On August 6, pickets protesting U.S. participation in the Viet Nam war staged a demonstration on the lawn of the State Capitol. The protest, which was peaceful and orderly, included five VISTA-AV workers from Raleigh County. While I affirm their right to their own views on the Vietnamese situation, the fact that they drove to Charleston in a clearly marked U.S. Government car, which was parked near the Capitol, attracted considerable attention, as the attached State Police report reveals. The use of a Federally-owned car for such purposes certainly is open to question."

Details: A VISTA working with the AVs admitted that she and a summer AV drove to Charleston from Beckley in a GSA car to do some sightseeing. The two workers stopped at the State Capitol and participated in an anti-Viet Nam war rally they found in progress. Later, they accompanied a demonstration leader to his home. After their visit, they went back to Beckley.

The AVs learned of this after Governor Smith's letter became public. They confirmed the incident and suspended the workers from further use of cars for a short period. VISTA has directed the AVs to make the suspension permanent. Short-term suspension was also imposed last winter when the AV staff learned that volunteers assigned to them had taken two GSA cars from Beckley to Bluefield to attend a movie. The summer AV involved left the AVs with the end of the summer program.

The GSA car was one assigned to a volunteer attached to the Beckley County CAA and borrowed for official purposes according to the AV staff.

Attempts to reach the State Department of Public Safety for information concerning the allegation that there were five VISTA-AV workers present from Raleigh County, rather than the two so far identified, have not been completed and will be checked out.

4. *Charge:* "A respected State Senator, Carl E. Gainer, from central West Virginia has protested formally the activities of VISTA and AV workers in Nicholas County. These persons apparently have called for the mass dismissal of a number of the county's elected officials and school personnel. While such social protest might be valid, the absence of constructive alternatives to the problems of the community has led to a general feeling that the VISTA-AV group is composed of 'trouble-makers' who offer only negative solutions to community problems. Charges of teaching 'ideas that are Communistic' have been made."

Details: Most of the controversy in Nicholas County has centered on the CAA education committee efforts to make changes in a Summerville High School. These efforts have included reports calling for the removal of the county school superintendent, the school board and the high school principal unless reforms are made. There have been no general or specific requests for resignations of other public officials. The AVs who worked in the county over the summer under the general direction of the local CAA director have not promoted the school issue, but have attempted to help get people out to meetings where these issues are being discussed. There was no evidence to support the charges of communism against the AVs contained in the letter to Governor Smith. Using leads supplied by the Principal complainant, no one was found in Richwood or Summerville with first-hand knowledge of what the VISTA workers have been doing in the areas

where they have worked—none indicated knowledge of VISTAs teaching communism.

EXHIBIT E

SHERIFF AND TREASURER,
RALEIGH COUNTY,

Beckley, W. Va., September 21, 1967.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: Attached you will find copy of a small publication which is being put out by some area citizens aided by VISTA workers and the Area Youth Corp.

Bob, the investigators sent into our area are doing and have done one of the best jobs of white-washing that I have ever witnessed. These so-called investigators came into this County after having made up their minds regarding the situation and refused to listen or look into any problems, they simply made as few calls as possible and then came away saying exactly the same things in exactly the same language they had used when they first arrived.

Preconceived ideas and indoctrination of the persons who have been sent in to evaluate the poverty programs have made it impossible to obtain anything but a biased report. Again, Bob, I would like to ask you and our other representatives for some help down here before it is too late.

Very sincerely yours,

OKEY A. MILLS,
Sheriff.

P.S. Bob, I still feel that part of the program is good. The administration of this program could have been planned by Civil Rights Leadership. I still hope we can have constructive changes in our Federal setup. It may be too late already. Bob, send some investigators from your Democratic Caucus to look into this Federal Stupidity.

Sincerely,

OKEY.

SHERIFF AND TREASURER,
RALEIGH COUNTY,

Beckley, W. Va., February 17, 1967.

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JENNINGS: We are asking your help in trying to solve a problem caused by one of our Democratic Programs that has reached the place where it is to the point of being fantastic. I make direct reference to the Vista Program under the C.A.A.

I will not bother you with merous details but it is hard for me to believe this program, as it is being administered, is a result of the thinking of any sane department of our U.S. Government. It would see that it was dreamed up in a mental institution.

This program is making the Democratic Party in our County look ridiculous to the point of absurdity. It is beyond my imagination to think that the results of this program could be due to the direct action of any sub-divisions of our government and the blame thereto laid directly to the Democratic Party. There is one person that I know of that would be pleased with this program and that is Gus Hall.

I would be most pleased if we could get someone to come to Raleigh County and investigate the actions of these people. I would also appreciate someone investigating the feelings of local people as a direct result of this program. We have many Federal Programs under the Democrats which are worth while and should be progressing as far as the Government is concerned and the Democratic Party is concerned. We are sitting on our rear ends and letting two or three parts of the program not only tear down all of the good that the rest of the program is doing but is disgusting our Democratic wage earning citizens to the point that they have resentment toward the Federal Government

that is reaching the point of no return. I am making direct reference to people who have been good Democrats all their life and have worked for a living and do not owe anyone a dime and have voted Democratic because they wanted to.

I, personally, am a strong Democrat and intend to remain a loyal Democrat but I am disgusted with this program and if something is not done by the leaders of our party, I fully intend to make a personal call to Drew Pearson and ask him to come down and check into this program. I hope that this is not necessary but if some action is not taken by our leaders, I will not be deterred in my intention to follow through. If you think that the only trouble in this program is in Raleigh County, I would suggest that you check with the other counties that have this program.

In conclusion, let me say, please pay attention to this letter.

Very sincerely yours,

OKEY A. MILLS,
Sheriff.

BRADLEY, W. VA.,
January 10, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: We have discussed the expenditure of funds for Community Action Programs and especially those paid to Vista workers.

Admittedly Vista workers can do good work in certain areas of the world if educated and trained but I do not believe an 18 or 19 year old can come into Raleigh County without training, looking in most cases more in need of assistance than our own people, and accomplish much in the way of a "better life" for those in the rural areas.

I am enclosing two clippings from our local paper which I feel may be of interest to you. I certainly do not know of any training program in Raleigh County which would produce qualified workers for the Vista program.

No doubt this lack of training is considered to be an asset to a Vista worker as Radio advertising for Vista Workers specifies "No Training" required.

I trust something will be done about this reckless spending of our tax money.

Sincerely,

J. A. BLACKBURN.

THE SENATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
August 8, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am enclosing a news release which appeared in the Sunday Gazette August 6, 1967 and a letter from one of my constituents dated August 5, 1967 which I sincerely believe at this time is the genuine concern of most of the citizens of Nicholas County.

It is rather unusual that any group would be wanting to ask the resignation of the School Superintendent, Principal of Summersville High School, the Sheriff and the County Road Supervisor all in the same meeting. It is also unusual that Senator Paul Kaufman and Ralph Murphine would be present for the Friday night meeting along with the Vista Workers and Appalachia Volunteers. As far as I can tell there was no announcement made to the general public of this meeting and only these people selected by the Vistas and Volunteers were transported to the meeting in their own cars.

I have watched the Vista Workers from the beginning of the program and I believe that I made the statement to Senator Randolph and Governor Smith at lunch at my home last August before the Cherry River Navy parade that if they were allowed to continue they would defeat the Democratic Party in the 1968 election.

It has certainly become more evident in my district with the increase of these workers coming in the county. No doubt, a very small percentage of these workers are sincere and do a good job by and large the majority are a bunch of improperly misguided misfits who are I believe endangering our concept of law and order in this nation. I do not think these workers were ever needed in this County and would respectfully ask for their resignation.

Very truly yours,

CARL E. GAINER,
State Senate.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the Allen-Scott Report in Daily Mail (Charleston, W. Va.) on July 31, 1967, report was made of charges by Rep. James Gardner (R-NC) implicating government financed anti-poverty workers in inciting riots and directly involved in agitations.

Under ordinary conditions, I would not get too excited about this item, for it did not directly concern our community, but after some unpleasant publicity regarding anti-poverty workers (Better Community Action-OEO) in this county, I feel a protest is in order.

Here in this county, we have good stable citizens who are interested in progress, education and all the better things for our families . . . and until now, we have had no smirching of our schools with dope raids, long-haired, rude and untidy students, moral problems and the like. This has been due to the fine Administrators employed by the Board of Education. However, at the moment, meetings are held by the Community Action Groups with guest speakers from surrounding counties promoting changes and shouting unfair school policies and charging public institutions with "lining their mink-lined pockets".

I am a high school teacher and a mother of two teen-agers. I resent the implications that our school people are doing so many things wrong, for I know that is not true. Personally, I like strict rules in the schools for that makes for much better schools and better future citizens. At this very moment the Community Action seek the resignation of our fine Principal and Assistant. Only last week they demanded the resignation of our Superintendent of Schools.

These Administrators are fine, intelligent, and dedicated men who could further their financial status by going to other states, but have not done so. We are most fortunate to have matters in the schools handled so efficiently and there is not need for anti-poverty to advise these experienced and well trained educators.

I deeply resent that my hard earned teacher dollars help to pay these inexperienced, untrained, and hysterical workers. Instead of Better Community they very well might force this community to a much worse one.

You will find enclosed some newspaper clippings which will further explain this matter and will somehow convince you that I am not a hysterical constituent whose sole purpose is to complain and make trouble. These Better Community Workers are a detriment to our school. Can someone do something to help us retain our previous status without OEO interference?

Very truly yours,

Librarian.

WILLIAMSON PIGGLY WIGGLY, INC.,
Williamson, W. Va., August 2, 1967.
U.S. Senator ROBERT BYRD,
House of Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We are a Kentucky firm located in Pike County, Kentucky, bordering a West Virginia county, Mingo, and enjoy a

reasonable amount of business from West Virginia.

On Monday, July 31, 1967, a group of VISTA workers entered our store. They arrived at our store in a government car driven by a female. This group was composed of two colored girls and three colored boys. We do not know if they all were VISTA workers. These workers have headquarters in your state in Mingo County.

While the girls shopped as normal one of the boys wandering through different departments of the store entered our produce department. He had a marks-a-lot pencil, which is a pencil used for marking merchandise. He marked 5¢ on a lemon. An employee of ours, Benjamin Beverly, advised him that our Manager would not approve of this. He said "I'm not afraid of your manager or anyone else in the store." Beverly said "I am not the only boy in the store, we have more in the back room." The colored boy walked away from the produce department toward the meat department and our Meat Manager, David Crigger, heard him say "Do you think one of them could shoot this gun I have in my pocket." He then asked Mr. Crigger if he had any Hard Coconuts. Mr. Crigger advised him that he would have to ask our produce clerk. The boy then said "He is just like you, he doesn't know anything either." Mr. Crigger did not reply and the boy walked away.

Several of our customers noticed his rudeness and saw him re-enter the government car with the others. A government car being a carrier of this type of ill will could be projected in the minds of on lookers as an ally of this type of doings.

We do not wish to magnify this incident and we know it is small in comparison with the racial disturbances elsewhere, but if this is an example of the attitudes and actions of any government group it could very well cause some bad situations.

We do not discriminate in our employment and now have, as we have had in the past, colored employees.

We again emphasize that we do not want to ignite a fuse, only hope that this bit of information will help to serve as one of the many corrective measures that are so badly needed in this racial strife.

Yours truly,

WILLIAMSON PIGGLY WIGGLY, INC.
CLAUDE P. VARNEY, Manager.

AUGUST 10, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT BYRD,
Washington, D.C.:

We have some V. Vista workers here in Wyo. Co. who is working against the Democrat party and causing a lot of disturbances among people, one here, 20 yr. old from rich family in Chicago. I hear all that is going on in Post Office, let me know what this is all about. They are telling the people here that they aren't getting what is due them. Get a big stir up about the water works and giving the ring in Wyo. Co. thunder. Thanks for an answer or get these people out of here.

Yours truly,

POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Huntington, W. Va., July 31, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: For the past several weeks, the City of Huntington has been fraught with rumors of racial strife; i.e., riots, looting, burning, etc. On every occasion we have attempted to get to the source of the rumors and found each of them to be untrue. However, we have found that each time these rumors started one or more of the following people were in the City: Phillip Carter Negro/Male, Pat Austin Negro/Female, Ann Adams White/Female, and Marion Hanley White/Female. From past experience we know these people are trouble makers. Our

information now is that each are active in the furtherance of the Black Power Movement. They were each in the City of Huntington over this past weekend attempting to set up Black Power Movement meetings.

Our information is that Carter, Austin, Adams, and possibly Marion Hanley are employees of the Federal Government. Philip Carter is reported to be employed by OEO in some capacity in Norman, Oklahoma. The three females are reported to be employed by OEO in some capacity in New York City. Carter was formerly assigned to the Job Corps at Lake Vesuvius in Ironton, Ohio; Pat Austin and Ann Adams were employed in some capacity with the Job Corps in the City of Huntington and Marion Hanley was employed by Action in the City of Huntington.

We have the best of relations with the local F.B.I. agents; however, we sometimes feel that information we pass on to them and which they forward to Washington may be filtering back to these same people. We have no basis of fact for this except our intuition.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could possibly cause a confidential check made of these people through your office to determine if they are employees of the Federal Government. It is felt that the appointment of the Blue Ribbon Commission by the President to investigate riots will be of no value if the Federal Government in fact is financing, at least in an indirect manner, people of this caliber who are advocating revolution in this country.

Your assistance in this matter will be greatly appreciated and any other information we might be able to furnish you on Carter, Austin, Adams, and Hanley, we would be glad to do so.

Sincerely,

G. H. KLEINKNECHT,
Chief of Police.

LAW OFFICES SAYRE & SAYRE,
Beckley, W. Va., May 5, 1967.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: The great "Vista Workers" of the Johnson-Kennedy-Shriver regime made a vicious attack on Presidents Hoover and Eisenhower at their Jacksons Mill training program this week, according to the newspapers, and the Rev. Jack S. Stephenson of Cincinnati, director of the training camp, said the trainees were giving vent to their expression. This damnable practice and procedure should stop and our senators and congressmen should see that it stops. The taxpayers of this country are paying the bill and we have a right to expect better treatment.

This entire program is a farce from beginning to end. Some of these so-called volunteers came into Raleigh County and proceeded to stir up all the trouble they could. We have some surface mining going on in our county and last summer we had a disastrous and unprecedented flood and it caused some damage, and they proceeded to go abroad, hauling people to the site, trying to make a mountain out of a molehill, while the company was doing everything possible to rectify the damages done. They even went to the legislature and made all kinds of untrue statements, and you might say stampered the Legislature of West Virginia into passing an unworkable surface mining law, and reported that our company had not done anything to alleviate the damage, and I quote with respect to one case from a letter written by an official of the company to a local lawyer in Beckley under date of January 9, 1967, concerning the claim being made by one, Ernest Bonds, concerning a very small parcel of land, and I quote from the letter without mentioning the name of the attorney:

"Sufficient information now has been fur-

nished by our engineers for reply to your letter of December 9, 1966, regarding claims in the vicinity of our mining operations at Drews Creek.

"We must take exception to your statement that in connection with these claims 'to date nothing has been done.' Prior to the date of your letter, property affected by our operations was landscaped by skilled people in a fashion which not only removed all debris, but also provided drainage superior to that which existed prior to our arrival. With respect to landscaping already accomplished, we have agreed to seed the same area at the appropriate time and that agreement will be kept.

"In accomplishing the foregoing, the following expenditures, in addition to our engineers' time, have been made:

"30 hours D-8 bulldozer rental at	
\$20 -----	\$600.00
8 hours grader rental at \$15-----	120.00
24 hours truck rental at \$10-----	240.00
Labor -----	202.84
Total -----	1,162.84

"Concerning the dwelling which allegedly was damaged by our blasting, our engineers carefully inspected this dwelling and found that the only condition of damage existing is the result of normal depreciation but in no way attributable to our operations.

"It always has been the policy of our companies to meet any responsibility to the public resulting from our operations and we believe you will find from personal inspection that we have more than done so in this instance."

This reputable attorney refused to prosecute their alleged vicious and unfounded claim.

The above states more completely the efforts made by the company I represent as an attorney than I am able to give you concerning the various claims made. The amount of work done to alleviate the damage amounted to more than the value of the land. This is just one instance of their trouble making.

During the last year or so there have been a lot of stories making the rounds concerning the actions and conduct of these people. One man was chosen by the Governor as Director of the Economic Opportunity Program for Raleigh County and he was not vicious enough and the Vista workers had him fired.

A grandson of a very well known Raleigh County citizen, now deceased, former state senator and well known lawyer throughout this section of West Virginia, was a dropout and in some manner got him a job and came into Raleigh County as a Vista worker. He traveled with others of lesser standing. He was dirty, clothes unclean and unkept, rooming in a home of a colored family in East Park, and I understand that they wouldn't keep him because he would go to bed with his shoes on. He never called on his grandmother, so I understand, although he was rooming within ½ mile of her home, and she did not know he was in the county. His grandmother is a very refined lady and not very well, and I expect she would have passed out if she had seen him or had received knowledge of what was going on.

This is just a sample of some of the Vista workers we have had in our county, and some of their actions and conduct would not stand the light of investigation. I don't know of any good they have done. They just cause trouble and raise the hell.

In order to save time I am sending a copy of this letter to Congressman Slack and a copy of Congressman Arch A. Moore.

With kindest personal regards to all three of you, I am

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD M. SAYRE.

HANOVER, W. VA.,
August 15, 1967.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have in our neighborhood four young people who say they have been sent here by the Federal Government to help Poverty Stricken people of W. Va.

They call themselves Appalachian Volunteers of America. They seem to be arousing suspicion among some people, whether they are really working for the betterment of the people in Wyoming County, W. Va., or are they going about ensnaring riots, are maybe Sedition. Will you please let me hear from you with literature concerning these people, as I'm very interested in helping the poverty programs. I've been working with these people and have seen nothing wrong, but the people won't help us if we don't furnish proof that they are sent out by the Federal Government as they say.

As I have written you before concerning floods in Huff Creek District, and you have always given my letters your immediate attention I'm hoping you will do the same with this one. Dredging Huff Creek, building bridges and better schools is what we hope these people are working for.

Please give this your attention quickly as possible so I can show the people of Huff Creek what to expect of these people.

Very truly yours,

W. W. C.

GLEN DANIEL, W. VA.,
January 12, 1967.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Would it be possible for you senators to send a committee to Raleigh County to investigate the programs and methods being sponsored by the VISTA workers? I believe if congressmen can see, first-hand, the class division, the strife, and malice that is being generated right here in Raleigh County, you will want to stop it now.

When the VISTAS speak of the "people", they mean only those on relief and welfare checks. The rest of us aren't "people", we are only taxpayers.

We Raleigh County people aren't so unable to solve our own problems that "volunteers" from all over the United States have to come here and do it for us. The biggest barrier has been financial in the past. Now that funds are available, please give us a chance to work out our own problems and not send an avalanche of "young beatniks" to do it for us.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senators Randolph, Mansfield, and Dirksen.

Please help us in this struggle for self-respect.

Sincerely yours,

V. S.

DELBARTON, W. VA.,
August 5, 1967.

DEAR SIR: I am again writing you concerning the work of the Poverty Program in Mingo County, after two special meetings of the Lee District C.A.G., called by the County organization in an attempt to oust this present group, an effort which failed, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Mingo County E.O.C., Mr. Gerald Chafin, said they were to work with the present group, who is truly interested in trying to help the community.

Our problem is the Appalachia Volunteer's Activities. They are constantly agitating and attempting to cause trouble. They have not succeeded with but a very few people but it is enough to cause many of our people to seemingly be afraid to come out to a C.A.O. Meeting.

Tonight we had a meeting for the purpose of screening applications for work in the

head start center. They came in with a man, who was highly intoxicated and kept interrupting the meeting. These volunteers are scattering hate, propaganda, plus the idea that people who work are against the poor.

It seems to us, since we have discussed this problem with various reliable people in our area that it is very much like a communist idea. Their feeling from all we can gather is overthrow regardless of what law is. Now, I ask you, Is this, what I, and others are paying taxes for?

Frankly, we think we speak a great number in our area—GET THEM OUT and let our people work here. I am sure we can do a better job of understanding the problems of the poor than can outside agitators.

Do we get any results? or is this to be ignored also? I am very much afraid of what the results will be if they are not removed.

None of us want trouble, but if they keep agitating, I am afraid for what could happen.

Yours very truly,

C. W.

DELBARTON, W. VA.,

August 6, 1976.

DEAR SIR: I attended a Community Action Meeting August 4, 1967 of the Lee District CAG of which I am Vice Chairman. The special meeting had been called to screen applications for employment in the head start center, and selection of two (2) people to serve on an advisory group for the center.

The Appalachian Volunteers came in with a man who was highly intoxicated and kept trying to agitate trouble as were the AV's. We finally succeeded in finishing our meeting, but outside the building one of the Appalachian Volunteers, Susan School, got a group of two or three together and was threatening to take me apart. Now I ask, is this what Government money is to go for? That people life-long residents cannot get together to transact business without threats? I think it's time we re-examine closely what is going on.

Many of the people are afraid to come out to meetings for fear of trouble. There must be something done about preventing agitators from receiving Government money or we'll just let the Communist take over. I am a firm believer in free speech, but peaceable. These people seemingly are not. The only thing they seem to know is force.

Many of the people to whom I have talked feel as I do. Get the Appalachian Volunteers and Vistas out. Let our community alone. Neighbors being neighborly, not at each other's throats. They are stirring up hate in everyone.

Needless to say, I feel that the riots could well have started with agitators such as these.

Respectfully yours,

H. B.

(Mr. BYRD of West Virginia assumed the chair as Presiding Officer at this point.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the hour is late and I shall be as brief as possible under the circumstances; but I should like to make a few comments on what the Senator from West Virginia has just said, and then proceed with a fairly brief argument in support of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967, which is title II of the pending bill.

Preliminarily, may I say that when the subcommittee of which I am chairman began its investigation of the poverty program in February of this year, we made a commitment that we would undertake neither a whitewash or a witch hunt. A good many months and more than 4,000 pages of testimony later, I think I can conscientiously say that we have kept that pledge.

This is not a whitewash. There are many things wrong with the poverty program. We have pointed them out in our report. We have undertaken, in this legislation, to remedy as many of them as could be remedied by tightening up legislation, and by seeking, through our oversight function, to point out to the Office of Economic Opportunity other areas where we believe administrative practices should be strengthened and improved, and, to some extent, drastically changed.

Nor was our investigation a witch hunt. We did not go out to get anybody. We did not ask a lot of loaded questions of witnesses, intended to show them up or make them look bad. We undertook to get at the truth. I believe our report does state the truth, states it objectively, states it fairly, states it clearly, and should be the basis for action by the Senate on the bill we have brought in.

The Senator from West Virginia suggests that there are many misleading statistics about the war on poverty, and complains that it is not a fair test to determine who is poor and who is not on the basis of the family incomes of the families in question.

I would reluctantly have to disagree with that point of view. I suggest that any reasonable person with the background of those of us who have been out and looked at the ghettos and met these people face to face, who have gone into their houses and seen their community facilities, who have discussed their plight not only with representatives of the OEO, but with local welfare workers, mayors, city councilmen, and various municipal and State departments, would come to the reasonable conclusion, as did a majority of the subcommittee—and I have no quarrel with the findings of other members of the subcommittee in the minority reports—that it is a pretty clearly established that there are, at the moment, somewhere in the neighborhood of between 27 million and 30 million American citizens, of all ages, races, creeds, and colors, who are living in penury by the standards set up by the OEO in the legislation to determine who is poor and who is not, by reasonable standards, standards on which we can rely.

I base this not only on the statistics which I have seen, but on the witness of my eyesight as I went around to look at these areas, all the way from the east to the west coast, down south in Mississippi, up to the Canadian border, in Chicago and elsewhere.

So I would respectfully disagree with my friend from West Virginia that the figures are distorted. In my opinion they are not, and there is now one-fifth of the Nation living ill-clothed, ill-fed, and ill-housed, just as there was, in Franklin Roosevelt's day, one-third of the Nation.

It is quite a bit of progress to go from one-third to one-fifth, and I am proud of what has been done in the intervening years. But as I say, Mr. President, there is a certain callousness in certain areas of the United States, particularly among those who have not been out to look at conditions in the urban and rural ghettos of this country. To me it is almost disgraceful that the richest Nation the

world has ever known, has done as little as it has, from a sense of compassion, to bring its poor citizens up to a decent level of civilized living. I assert again—and I regret to have to disagree with the Senator from West Virginia in this regard—that those people live in penury. Many of them are hungry and their children are hungry, and there does exist in America, in various places, starvation. I would take great exception to the report the Senator from West Virginia placed in the RECORD—I did not see it, but I heard his reference to it—to the effect that in excess of 90 percent of the American people are in fact well-fed, well-clad, well-housed, and on an adequate diet. Mr. President, that in my opinion is just not true.

The Senator from West Virginia complained about the Job Corps, and Job Corps data; he said it was conflicting. He said the record of the graduates of the Job Corps was, in many instances, defective.

I shall not undertake to answer that part of my friend's argument, because we discussed that matter this morning in connection with the debate on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. CURTIS] to eliminate the Job Corps. By a vote of 49 to 30, the Senate rejected the arguments made by the Senator from Nebraska and, I say in all good humor to my friend from West Virginia, the arguments which he reiterated this afternoon after the vote.

I think the statistics which have been shown as to who kept their jobs after they left the Job Corps and who got new jobs are correct statistics. I would stand by them.

My friend, as his fourth point, complained about the community action programs in many parts of the country and attacks that have been made by community action committees on the power structure and what is called "the establishment."

The Senator is correct, to some extent, in that regard. We did find, throughout the country, that there were instances where, to my way of thinking, irrational people undertook to attack the established elected officials in their particular communities. This I deplore.

On the other hand, we found, generally speaking, that these were very rare exceptions to the general rule. We also found that in a number of instances, in our opinion, the elected public officials deserved to be attacked because they were not giving a fair shake to the community action activities. And in some instances they were speaking against it.

What has happened across the country is that the poor have become articulate. Their voice, stilled by inadequate income and education, has risen to attack the conditions under which they live and under which they have been deprived for the most part of the good things in life which this country is perfectly capable of giving them.

This is a shock to many conservative people. I must say that it was a shock to me when I first saw it. I think that there have been some instances in which there has been inflammatory action.

I remember one witness in Los Angeles, whom I shall not name, whose behavior was entirely deplorable.

I remember an upstate New York city where I cannot believe that common-sense motivated the officials when they acted with such vigor and took such inflammatory action.

I say again that in my opinion these are rare exceptions and should not be translated into the rule. Moreover, generally speaking, the community action program have done vastly more good than they have done harm, and they are getting better every day.

The committee's records, which are on the desks of every Senator, bear strong witness to the soundness of the conclusions I have just stated, as, in fact, does the committee report.

I am not familiar with conditions in West Virginia, and I would not pretend to be. I have no doubt that the complaints which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has raised not only with respect to some conditions in his own State but also with respect to what he calls a subsidized version in Kentucky—with outside agitators and the like—may very well have some merit, and I would not want categorically to deny them.

I will say that the very able member of our committee, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] tells me that he has looked pretty carefully into these things and he still feels that it is his pleasure and obligation to support the bill, including emergency employment.

There are many times when I do not agree with my colleague from Pennsylvania. I go to no pains to conceal that fact. So, I can well understand that my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, the present occupant of the Chair, is well within his rights to say "That is true, but I do not agree with my colleague. I am right, and he is wrong." I have no quarrel with that. There are 2 sides to a question even in West Virginia.

The Senator's criticism of the VISTA program, exclusive of the mental health program in West Virginia, I am in no position to answer because I do not know the facts. However, again I feel compelled to say that I do know that wherever the committee went, with the exception of the criticism raised by the Senator from West Virginia, we found enthusiastic encomiums for the action of the VISTA volunteers.

I have attended a number of graduations of VISTA volunteers around the country and have made talks at these ceremonies. In my opinion, they are splendid young people, well worthy of the traditions of the Peace Corps, carried on on a domestic basis.

I do not wish to get into a discussion and argument with my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, in this regard. It may be that the VISTA volunteers in West Virginia are not doing what they should.

I think I can say on the basis of the investigation of the committee, the witnesses we heard, and the consultants whom we sent out to look into these matters that generally speaking across the country the VISTA volunteers are doing an extraordinarily fine job.

I hope that no effort will be made—and none has so far in the course of this

debate—to disturb the continuing program which they are presently engaged in carrying out.

My friend, the Senator from West Virginia, said, I believe, that the Headstart program should be transferred to the Office of Education. So did a number of other Senators. However, we voted on that a few days ago, and the majority determined to leave it where it is. I think it is unnecessary for me to comment further on it.

The Senator pointed out that he would like to have a reappraisal by an independent agency. He was kind enough to say that he was not critical of the committee or of the investigation it made. So did other Senators.

I was happy to accept the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and bring the General Accounting Office into the picture.

It may be that they can help us. I hope that they can. They are certainly well qualified in investigative techniques. How much understanding they have of the human elements involved here, we will see when they bring in their report. We now have the amendment in the bill. I suggest that, to that extent, we wait until next year to see what happens.

When it comes to the District of Columbia, the Senator from West Virginia is far more expert in that area than I am. I sat for 2 years on the District of Columbia Committee, but I got off by 1960 and cannot pretend to be an expert and I know that the Senator from West Virginia is. All I can say is that we did have one member of the subcommittee staff make what I thought was an investigation of some depth and inquire at some length concerning the poverty program in the District of Columbia.

He came back with a report speaking of it in glowing terms, admitting, of course, that there are some deficiencies.

I have no doubt that many of the specific instances mentioned by the Senator from West Virginia may very well be true. It is an enormous program. It would be surprising if there were not some defects.

The committee held 2 days of hearings here in Washington, at which leaders of the national planning organization and many others connected with the program testified.

Some of them were pretty critical of the effectiveness and the efficiency of the program.

I came out of that hearing, as one Senator, with an enormously high regard for Mr. Banks, executive director of the program who, unfortunately, in my judgment, has now left, and my friend, Mr. Lee, whom I look upon as a distinguished American.

He has held many high places in the Federal Government. In my opinion, he is also doing an excellent job as the chairman of the board of directors of the Upward Bound group, where he has to do a coordinating job that requires high skill. So I came out of the District of Columbia investigation with the feeling that by and large an excellent job was being done.

I do not know all the details. This is an area where I feel the Senator from West Virginia has superior knowledge and expertise in the field.

Let me speak briefly now about the Emergency Employment Act. The Senator has moved to recommit the entire bill with instructions to delete the Emergency Employment Act, title II.

I have no doubt that the Senator reaches a point of view in this regard which is shared by many of his colleagues, and it may well be that his point of view is shared by a majority—that we will find out tomorrow or a little later. I would not wish to quarrel with the Senator for his—in my judgment—unduly conservative point of view as to the very great need to have an emergency employment program to deal with the problems of the cities of America and the rural ghettos.

We saw a great deal of poverty as we went around the country—in the Delta counties of Mississippi, in the slums of Chicago, among the migrant workers in San Joaquin Valley in California, in Watts, and in a number of other places where I would suspect that the majority of the Senators have not had a real opportunity, as we in the subcommittee of necessity did, to see the conditions of misery and penury and squalor under which so many Americans are living, the end result being that thousands of them are being denied the good things in life and indeed are being deprived of their rights as free citizens of this great Republic.

The end result of the Senator's point of view—and I honor him for his point of view, as I say, because it is shared by many of his colleagues here—is that we will turn our back on the poor insofar as any effective employment program is concerned for the balance of this fiscal year.

We are turning our backs on the poor, if the Senator's views are to prevail—and I hope they will not—largely because the Senator thinks we cannot afford to support both the war in Vietnam and the war on poverty.

I have said enough on this subject on other occasions, so all I will do this evening is to define that issue and to point out that I have felt for a long time that we have a swollen military establishment, a military-industrial-scientific complex, which is taking this country down the road to disaster, and that we are neglecting many a problem which is a real threat to the civilization of which we are so proud when we put so much emphasis on the military and so little emphasis on our sense of compassion in doing what needs to be done for our needy fellow American citizens.

I shall not attempt to reply seriatim to the other arguments—and some of them are persuasive arguments—made by the Senator from West Virginia, but would rather turn away from an answer to his comments toward a positive espousal of the Emergency Employment Act.

In the hearings held by the committee throughout the length and breadth of the continental United States, I believe a clear consensus emerged that jobs are the single most important way to combat poverty. We had some pretty impressive testimony to that effect, which is set forth in the report of the committee. I shall do no more than to point out some of those who felt that jobs were the key answer—not the only answer, but the

key answer—to poverty in the urban and rural ghettos.

Erwin D. Canham, editor-in-chief of the *Christian Science Monitor* and chairman of the Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, told the committee:

Expert after expert, when consulted by the task force, has emphasized that income and place in the social and economic scheme can best be restored by providing the employable poor with training and job opportunities. These have the effect of bringing them into the mainstream of the economy, rather than merely paying them to remain outside.

Andrew Biemiller, director of legislation, AFL-CIO, recommended:

As a major aspect of the war on want we urge the inauguration of federally supported job-creating programs that would put the hard core unemployed to work providing needed public facilities and services.

Bayard Rustin, civil rights leader and executive secretary of the A. Phillip Randolph Institute, stated:

The great majority of the people who are poor, I am convinced, want work, but that work won't be found until we are prepared to establish a full and fair employment economy. We need public services, which is one means of creating full employment.

John Reading, mayor of Oakland, Calif., reported:

When visiting the neighborhood center, I find that most of all, the people want jobs. I feel very strongly, and the ones around me feel very strongly, that if we can provide jobs that we in turn then, over a period of time, to a great extent solve the rest of the social evils that apply to a poor city.

These leaders reflect the views of the American people. In a public opinion poll taken August 14, 1967, to determine what the people believe would be an effective way to deal with the urban crisis, Louis H. Harris & Associates, Inc., found that 69 percent of the public favor setting up large-scale Federal work projects to give jobs to the unemployed.

The conclusion that jobs are the central need of the poor is well founded in statistics. In 1966 when the U.S. unemployment rate averaged 3.8 percent, the rate for the disadvantaged was much higher; for all Negroes, 7.3 percent; for all 16- to 19-year-old youths, 12.7 percent but for Negro youth, about 25 percent. The unemployment rate for those with 8 years or less of education tends to run twice the national average for all workers.

A survey of 10 urban slum areas conducted by the Labor Department in November 1966 found 1 out of 10 workers unemployed. Yet these figures do not tell the true story, for they do not reveal the extent of hidden unemployment. To get the whole picture it is necessary also to consider those with part-time jobs who want full-time work, those earning too little to meet their families' minimum subsistence needs, and those who could work but are not looking because they are discouraged at the prospects. Adding these to the traditional unemployment rate yields what the Labor Department calls the "subemployment" rate. In the 10 slum areas, this rate was 34 percent, or three times the usually reported unemployment rate for those areas.

In magnitude, the number of unemployed and looking for work in the United States has averaged nearly 3 million during the first half of 1967. To reduce unemployment to a rate of 3 percent, which used to be the Federal goal, would take 600,000 new jobs. To take care of underemployment and hidden unemployment might take twice that number, and perhaps more.

Nonetheless, projecting the findings from the 10 slum areas to the Nation as a whole, the Labor Department concluded that, as bad as the problem is, it is of manageable proportions. Given more resources, the high rate of unemployment could be drastically reduced in a reasonable period of time. The committee is convinced that this would be true even with the addition of rural areas with severe unemployment, although the types of programs would vary some between urban and rural areas.

While a major part of the problem is the lack of job qualifications of the unemployed, no amount of training will solve the total problem unless the jobs are there. Conversely, if jobs are certain, training can be accelerated. As evidence, recall the illiterates who became production workers with only a few months on-the-job training during World War II.

The committee's amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, particularly to part B of title I, have expanded and strengthened the training programs for the disadvantaged. But this is not enough. The extent of unemployment in our inner city areas and in certain rural areas severely affected by technological change is such that a crisis exists. Emergency measures must be taken immediately. Federal funds should be invested now in creating jobs for the unemployed.

This reiterates what the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty recommended in 1964:

Federal, State, and local governments should undertake a joint program to directly employ the hard-core unemployed in poverty-stricken areas, both rural and urban, in an attack on the deficiencies of their own environments. Financial support should be provided by the Federal Government. Local governments and private groups should provide the proposals, planning, and administration.

Since then, three Federal commissions appointed by the President have affirmed this recommendations. In February 1966, the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress recommended a 5-year program of public service employment with a sum of \$2 billion for the first year. In June 1966, the White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights" urged the development of "Government-financed employment programs on public works and services to guarantee the availability of jobs to able workers who cannot be placed in, or promptly, trained for, regular employment." In July 1967, the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber proposed that Federal funds be granted to State and local governments and certain types of nonprofit institutions which would serve as "the residual employer" in rural areas with high unemployment until economic development programs can take hold.

Each of these bodies has identified pub-

lic service employment as an especially fruitful source of additional, socially useful jobs. The "Automation" Commission, for example, estimated that at least 5.3 million such jobs could be filled: 1.2 million in medical institutions and health services, 1.1 million in educational institutions, 1.3 million in national beautification, 700,000 in welfare and home care, 350,000 in public protection, and 650,000 in urban renewal and sanitation. In a study conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity, Greenleigh Associates, Inc., calculated that it would be practicable to fill more than 400,000 such jobs during the first year of a new employment program.

The evidence is strong and consistent. Jobs are central to solving the crisis of cities and depressed rural areas. Public service employment provides an immediate remedy. Federal resources must be used, but the job creation programs should be locally operated. All that is lacking is the national commitment. To supply this missing link the committee recommends the adoption of the Emergency Employment Act of 1967.

I have already adverted to the statement of the Urban Coalition, which specifically endorsed the Emergency Employment Act, which was jointly submitted to the committee by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, and which comes to the floor with the support of a majority of the committee.

Before asking unanimous consent that the statement of the Urban Coalition of September 15 be printed in full in the *Record*, I should like to point out that the members of the Urban Coalition represent a uniquely wide spectrum of respectable opinion in the United States.

We have had some talk—some of it in a lighter vein, some of it not—about the "establishment" in America; but I would say that, across the spectrum, from respected leaders of industry and banking through the chief executives of our principal municipalities, to prominent educators and churchmen, across to noted civil rights leaders and the leaders of the great labor movements in our country, we have in this Urban Coalition about as powerful a group of respected citizens as is possible to bring together.

I will not read the names of all of them, but among them are Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board of Time, Inc., and for many years the publisher of *Life* magazine; and A. Philip Randolph, the well-known civil rights and labor leader. They include the mayor of Atlanta, the mayor of Philadelphia, the mayor of Pittsburgh, the mayor of Detroit, the mayor of Boston, the mayor of Chicago.

These are the people who have to deal with the problems in the urban ghettos. They include Arnold Aronson, the executive secretary of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. They include some substantial industrialists: Roy Ash, president of Litton Industries; Frederick J. Close, chairman of the board of Aluminum Co. of America; Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; David Rockefeller, president of Chase Manhattan Bank; Theodore Schlesinger, president of Allied Stores; Asa T. Spaulding, president of

North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co.; Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co. Mayor Lindsay, of New York, I should not have skipped.

Prominent, too, are labor leaders George Meany and Walter Reuther. Among the civil rights leaders are Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young, Jr.

This is just a sampling of the strength of this leadership.

I now ask unanimous consent that the statement of the coalition, issued on September 15, specifically endorsing title II of this bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF URBAN COALITION SEPTEMBER 15, 1967

The Urban Coalition endorses the Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act as a significant step toward an urgently needed national emergency program to provide at least one million jobs. We urge the President to support it and we urge Congress to adopt it as part of the Economic Opportunity Act amendments this year.

With regard to the private sector, we commend Mr. Gilbert Fitzhugh of our National Steering Committee and the Insurance Industry for their recently announced commitment of \$1 billion in mortgage and investment funds for the reconstruction of the core areas of our cities. We are encouraged that the program will take advantage of rent supplements and that the federal government has developed an FHA-mortgage insurance program for these areas as well as middle and upper income families in the suburbs.

In support of the job program, the Emergency Convocation, held in Washington on August 24, and attended by 1,000 representatives of business and industry, organized labor, religious groups, local government and civil rights organizations, endorsed a Declaration of Principles, Goals and Commitments which called for legislation consistent with the following principles:

The federal government must enlist the cooperation of government at all levels and of private industry to assure that meaningful, productive work is available to everyone willing and able to work.

To create socially useful jobs, the emergency work program should concentrate on the huge backlog of employment needs in parks, streets, slums, countryside, schools, colleges, libraries, and hospitals. To this end, an emergency work program should be initiated and should have as its first goal putting at least one million of the presently unemployed into productive work at the earliest possible moment.

The program must provide meaningful jobs—not dead-end, make work projects—so that the employment experience gained adds to the capabilities and broadens the opportunities of the employees to become productive members of the permanent work force of our nation.

Basic education, training, and counseling must be an integral part of the program to assure extended opportunities for upward job mobility and to improve employee productivity. Funds for training, education, and counseling should be made available to private industry as well as to public and private nonprofit agencies.

Funds for employment should be made available to local and state governments, nonprofit institutions, and federal agencies able to demonstrate their ability to use labor productively without reducing existing levels of employment or undercutting existing labor standards or wages which prevail for comparable work or services in the area but are not less than the federal minimum wage.

Such a program should seek to qualify new employees to become part of the regular work force and that normal performance standards are met.

The operation of the program should be keyed to specific localized unemployment problems and focused initially on those areas where the need is most apparent.

The Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act is responsive to these principles. It is also responsive to the conditions of unemployment and despair revealed in the dozens of hearings held over many months by the Senate Sub-Committee on Unemployment and is consistent with the findings and recommendations of the National Committee on Technological Automation and Economic Progress (Feb. 1966), the White House Conference to Fulfill These Rights (June 1966), and The National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber (July 1967).

In addition, we call upon Congress to expedite action in providing full funding for the poverty program, the rent supplement program and Model Cities. We also urge the adoption of the Equal Opportunity in Housing measure now pending in both houses.

We offer our full support in implementing these objectives.

ANDREW HEISKELL,
Cochairman.
A. PHILIP RANDOLPH,
Cochairman.

Mr. CLARK. The statement points out that an emergency convocation was held in Washington on August 24, attended by a thousand representatives of business and industry, organized labor, religious groups, local government, and civil rights organizations; and it endorsed the statement of principles, goals, and commitments which has just been printed in the RECORD.

I should point out that the coalition statement called upon Congress to pass emergency job legislation which would create 1 million jobs. That was a little too rich for the blood of Senator JAVITS and myself. We cut that 1 million down to 200,000, for 2 years, which could grow to 300,000 or perhaps 350,000, depending on how the program would be administered during that 2-year period.

We felt it was not feasible, under present congressional sentiment, to do what these leaders of business, labor, industry, and church groups asked us to do. Their program would have cost a minimum of \$5 billion for 1 year, or \$10 billion for 2 years. Ours, I point out, is a much more modest program.

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia did not advert to Senator PROUTY's amendment, nor have I done so in this talk. But Senator PROUTY and I had a colloquy about it earlier today, which interested Senators can read in the RECORD. I must say that, as a pragmatist and, I hope, a realistic Senator and politician, I believe the best hope of doing something for the poor, unemployed Americans who live in our urban and rural ghettos, on this 3d day of October 1967, in the light of congressional sentiment, is for me, as the floor manager of this bill, to accept the Prouty amendment.

I have discussed this matter with my colleagues on the subcommittee which reported the bill. They feel as I do, that if we could get the entire \$2.8 billion for a 2-year program, this possibly would be perfection.

They feel it is most dubious that this

could be done. They feel it is important, and so do I, that this should be a bipartisan effort to help the poor of America; not a Republican effort or a Democratic effort, but a bipartisan effort to join hands together to do something for these poor fellow citizens of ours who are denied so many of the good things of life.

I shall support the Prouty amendment tomorrow and I hope it will be agreed to. The Senator from Vermont described the measure at some length earlier this afternoon. I asked him a number of questions to bring out the strengths and possibly the weaknesses of his amendment. We will have little time tomorrow to debate the Prouty amendment.

Therefore, I say tonight that I shall support that amendment. I hope that absent Senators who may be interested will read of this support in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow, and perhaps our long-suffering friends of the press—who I am sure want to get home for dinner as much as I do—will report the commitment I have just made.

(At this point Mr. CLARK assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I shall not prolong the discussion, except for a moment. I wish to say that I respect the viewpoint of the distinguished, able, and congenial Senator from Pennsylvania. I admire his compassion for the poor, and what I have said this afternoon was not in any way any personal criticism of his efforts. I know that he has put a great deal of thought and much effort into developing the hearings, taking the testimony therein, and into formulating the bill that is before the Senate.

I congratulate the Senator for his zeal. I share his compassion for the poor. I am sorry we cannot agree with regard to the wisdom of retaining title II in the bill.

I would imagine that, if exhaustive hearings were held on the subject, it might be possible, at some future time and under appropriate circumstances, for his subcommittee to bring some language before the Senate that I and other Senators who oppose title II could accept. However, as I said earlier, I believe it is the wrong time now and the wrong approach. I have made my case against title II and I shall not attempt to repeat it now.

I expect to vote for the bill on final passage, but this would be difficult for me to do if title II were to remain in this bill.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of Senators who will read the RECORD in the morning, perhaps I should recall that, in accordance with the unanimous-consent request propounded by the majority leader today, it was agreed that after the prayer and disposition of the Journal tomorrow morning there will be a live quorum, following which 20 minutes will be allotted to the debate on the Prouty amendment, the time to be equally divided between the proposer thereof, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued October 5, 1967
For actions of October 4, 1967
90th-1st; No. 158

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,13,34	Extension service.....11	Reclamation.....38
Area development.....8	Fisheries.....11	Recreation.....20,39
CCC.....5	Food additives.....31	Research.....4
Census.....22	Forestry.....7	School lunch.....21
Commodity exchanges.....41	Holidays.....28	Spending.....9,19
Consumers.....24	Migrant workers.....3	Taxation.....23,40
Continuing	Military construction....2	Textile imports.....27
appropriations.....1	Mining claims.....15	Tobacco.....10
Contracts.....37	Oceanography.....25	Trade practices.....14
Cooperatives.....6,14	Pay.....16	Transportation.....30
Cotton.....36	Personnel.....16	Vocational
Education.....26,33	Postal rates.....16	rehabilitation.....33
Electrification.....12,35	Poverty.....3,18	Water pollution.....29
Employment.....17	Product safety.....32	Wilderness.....20

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed continuing appropriations resolution, and House concurred in amendment. Senate debated poverty bill. House committee voted to report bill to prohibit unfair trade practices affecting cooperatives. House Rules Committee cleared pay bill.

SENATE

- 1. APPROPRIATIONS.** Passed H. J. Res. 853, to continue appropriations for departments and agencies whose regular appropriation bills have not yet been enacted. Agreed to an amendment, which had been reported by the Appropriations Committee earlier in the day (S. Rept. 580), to change the expiration date from Oct. 10 to Oct. 23. The House concurred in the amendment. This measure will now be sent to the President. pp. S14123-31, H12921

2. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 11722, the military construction bill, which includes a provision to reimburse CCC for financing certain military housing through commodity operations. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. S14131
 3. POVERTY. Continued debate on S. 2388, to continue and amend the Economic Opportunity Act (pp. S14119-23, S14131-57, S14161-3, ~~S14165~~, S14224-5, ~~S14227~~). Agreed to amendments by Sen. Monroney to provide for research and pilot projects to slow migration from rural areas to urban centers and to bar financial assistance in any case when the cost of developing and administering Urban and Rural Community Action Programs exceeds 15% of the total cost (pp. S14151-6). Rejected amendments by Sen. Murphy to grant Governors of States a limited veto power on programs for migrant workers, by a 41-45 vote (pp. S14140-50), and to provide that no project under the legal services program may grant assistance to bring action against the Government, by a 36-52 vote (pp. S14161-3).
 4. RESEARCH. Sen. Javits defended his bill to protect laboratory animals and inserted statements on this matter. pp. S14159-60
 5. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. Sen. Carlson stated that CCC's investment is at a 15-year low and that this "provides a solid basis to move forward toward a much-needed improvement in farm income." p. S14160
 6. COOPERATIVES. Sen. Mondale inserted an article by the Vice President, "Cooperatives: A National Asset." pp. S14166-7
 7. FORESTRY. Sen. Gruening commended the work of Indians and Eskimos in fighting forest fires in Alaska. pp. S14173-4
 8. AREA DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Pearson inserted an article suggesting that obsolete military bases be used to locate industry in underemployed areas. p. S14174
 9. SPENDING. Sen. Proxmire recommended an intensive review to insure that Government programs are funded only if they return significant benefits. pp. S14184-5
 10. TOBACCO. Sen. Tydings inserted his testimony favoring H. R. 7986, to allow Md. tobacco farmers to receive export subsidies on their tobacco even though they rejected marketing quotas. pp. S14185-6
 11. FISHERIES. Sen. Kennedy, Mass., inserted a summary of his fisheries development bill, S. 2426, which includes provisions for a fisheries extension service, a study of fishery imports, additional research on fish protein concentrate, and fishery marketing agreements. pp. S14198-200
 12. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Long, Mo., saluted Clyde T. Ellis, who is retiring from the National Rural Electric Association. pp. S14205-6
- HOUSE
13. APPROPRIATIONS. By a vote of 226 to 173, H. R. 10196, the Labor and HEW appropriation bill, was recommitted to conference "with the instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments which exceed the budget request therefor." pp. H12921-29

Senate

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1967

(Legislative day of Monday, October 2, 1967)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Father Alexander George, pastor of the St. John's Eastern Orthodox Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, in an era of trial, confusion, and anxiety, we turn to You, as an ever-present help in time of trouble.

You have blessed us and we are grateful. We thank You for this land, for its material resources and spiritual blessings, but one more thing we require of You—the vision, the courage, and the determination to build the kind of world in which You would have Your children live—a world of universal freedom, justice, and peace.

We thank You for this Senate which was called to establish such a world. Undergird our spirits and strengthen our faith that we may remain tireless in our efforts, loyalty unwavering, courage unflinching, and hope invincible that our dream may be translated into a blessed reality. For this we pray through the One who turned people into followers and caused the revolution, Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 3, 1967, be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, in accordance with the previous agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 274 Leg.]

Aiken	Church	Gruening
Anderson	Clark	Hansen
Brewster	Cotton	Harris
Brooke	Curtis	Hart
Burdick	Dirksen	Hartke
Byrd, Va.	Dominick	Hickenlooper
Carlson	Ellender	Hill

Kennedy, N.Y.	McIntyre
Lausche	Metcalf
Long, Mo.	Monroney
Long, La.	Morton
Mansfield	Nelson
McCarthy	Pearson
McGee	Pell
McGovern	Percy

Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Scott
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, Del.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allott	Hayden	Mundt
Bartlett	Holland	Murphy
Bennett	Hollings	Muskie
Bible	Hruska	Randolph
Boggs	Inouye	Smathers
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Smith
Cannon	Javits	Sparkman
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Dodd	Kennedy, Mass.	Tydings
Eastland	Kuchel	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	Magnuson	Yarborough
Fong	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Miller	Young, Ohio
Griffin	Mondale	
Hatfield	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, No. 371, offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. The time for debate is under the control of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]

and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], each Senator being allotted 10 minutes.

Who yields time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I would like to review briefly for the benefit of my colleagues the provisions of the Prouty-Scott amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Emergency Employment Act contained in title II of this bill.

Under our version, priority will be given to heads of families who are unemployed or low-income persons living in poverty in filling all positions created under title II.

We have added a part B to title II called the Human Investment Training Act. This is patterned in many respects on the Human Investment Act approach which I have sponsored for the last 3 years and which is supported by most of my Republican colleagues. Under this provision, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to make financial grants covering job-training costs to employers in private industry who institute training programs for the disadvantaged poor under plans approved by the Secretary of Labor.

Up to 37½ percent of title II funds may be used by the Secretary for implementing this type of creative job training. The Secretary of Labor may also spend an additional 20 percent of title II money for making further training programs available under the highly regarded on-the-job training and other MDTA programs.

Some of my colleagues sincerely believe that make-work programs provide an answer to our poverty problems. In my opinion, however, such an approach constitutes no real long-range solution to the war on poverty and is warranted only to the extent that some of our people are at a point in life where further education and training cannot qualify them for productive jobs.

Our proposal also contains much more realistic provisions with respect to funding of title II programs which should appeal to many who are concerned about increasing the fiscal deficit through excessive spending on nonmilitary programs.

There is presently a \$2.8 billion authorization for title II of the bill. The Prouty-Scott substitute amendment reduces this authorization to \$875 million plus \$50 million for interest-free loans which will eventually be repaid to the Treasury.

This substantial saving is accomplished by eliminating all authorizations

for fiscal 1969 and by substantially reducing the authorizations for fiscal 1968 which will have but 6 or 7 months remaining by the time this bill becomes law.

Mr. President, the concept that poverty can be substantially reduced only by the involvement of the private sector of our economy in meaningful training programs has received support from many and diverse sources.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz, in testimony before our committee, commented: .

The most underdeveloped aspect of the manpower program (and possibly the poverty program as well) involves the potential for increased private participation.

The 1967 manpower report to the President concluded that a basic issue in the occupational training task confronting us was "the possibility and desirability of financial assistance to employers to help them continue to carry the largest share of the training burden."

General President Hutcheson of the Carpenters' Union wrote in his organization's newspaper last year that—

Any program undertaken ought to be based on a reasonable assumption that there will be a place for a youngster when he has completed his training. Any other approach is neither fair to the youngster, to the industry, or to the nation.

Nationally syndicated financial columnist Sylvia Porter wrote early this year:

The basic, long term answer to skill shortages can only be drastically improved and increased vocational education and job training by private industry as well as by government agencies.

And, a well-known authority in the field of manpower programs recently told me that a survey which he had conducted around the country showed that MDTA had the capability to expand very rapidly and that participants in such programs could easily be doubled, but that "nobody has made that kind of proposal for MDTA."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, involvement by private enterprise is the direction emphasized by the Prouty-Scott amendment, rather than the making of thousands of unmeaningful WPA-type jobs. Under our proposal, upon which you will shortly vote, more than \$500 million of the \$875 million authorized for title II will be available to the Secretary of Labor for implementing human investment and MDTA on-the-job training programs by private employers, and for other vocational and institutional training programs under MDTA. Of course, as I have already pointed out, priority in filling these positions will be given to unemployed and low-income persons in the poverty category who are heads of families.

Our substitute amendment also includes the amendment proposed by the junior Senator from South Dakota, which expands the definition of "eligible areas" for these programs to include

rural areas which have problems of out-migration.

Mr. President, facing the issues squarely, I hope that the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee will find it possible to support the Prouty-Scott amendment, together with a majority of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I ask unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from West Virginia yield himself?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, the Prouty-Scott amendment would substitute for the present title II of S. 2388 a modified version of that title, which would include both the Clark-Javits Emergency Employment Act—part A—and the Prouty Human Investment Act—part B—with a total authorization of \$925 million for fiscal 1968. The amendment would thus authorize \$375 million less than would be authorized for the Emergency Employment Act under the present title II in this fiscal year.

The amendment contains no fiscal 1969 authorization. The present title II would authorize \$1.5 billion in fiscal 1969.

Under this amendment, at least 12½ percent of \$875 million—\$109,375,000—and up to 37½ percent of that sum—\$327,125,000—would support part B projects, under which the Secretary of Labor would, pursuant to employer-submitted plans, make grants to employers to cover the costs of training and employing eligible persons.

Section 215 would extend tax advantages to employers receiving such assistance.

The remainder of \$875 million would support part A, the Clark-Javits program. Fifty million dollars—instead of \$300 million proposed by the committee—would be available for loans to support part A projects which, it is thought, would induce businesses to relocate in the ghettos.

Mr. President, with all due respect to my distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Pennsylvania, I am compelled to state my opposition to the amendment which they have proposed to my motion to recommit.

The Senators propose the expenditure of just under a billion dollars to support virtually the same extremely dubious employment program approved by the committee, as well as to further the laudable purpose of getting business involved in training the poor. But the war on pov-

erty is already involving business in training the poor—on an experimental basis—because neither OEO nor business yet knows for certain what will work best. No new legislative authority is needed and, until the experiments are evaluated, it would be the height of fiscal irresponsibility to pour in almost another billion dollars at the same time we are being asked to increase taxes.

The war on poverty is in trouble now because it has been trying to do too much too fast. What is needed now is a shakedown of current programs, not a hasty new beginning in a number of new directions.

There is plenty of authority in current legislation to do what is proposed by the Senator from Vermont. There are new pilot programs in these directions currently being begun or recently announced—all under current authorities.

For example, just the day before yesterday, President Johnson announced a \$40-million pilot program under authority currently possessed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and other Government agencies to get private enterprise even more heavily involved in the war on poverty. The President made clear that these programs would be experimental in nature—that no one in or out of Government knew precisely which ones would work nor how they would work.

In the past few years, other programs of this general nature have been begun. In his speech yesterday, the Senator from Vermont was high in his praise of the Labor Department's on-the-job training program. But on-the-job training already exists under current legislation, and the Department of Labor has not requested additional authority nor does it need such authority.

In addition, OEO is currently experimenting with new approaches to the involvement of private business. If they work, their cost to the Federal budget and to the U.S. economy will be substantially less than the cost of the program proposed by the Senator from Vermont. An example is the success insurance program, which is designed to induce private employers to take the poor into training slots by reimbursing business only for those poor trainees who did not work out in these new jobs. It is quite clear that title I of the bill reported by the committee contains plenty of authority to continue and expand these approaches. Section 123 alone allows many new and experimental training programs, whether public or private. It allows ample authority for programs originally proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania as well as authority for these now proposed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, let us think for a moment of the American taxpayer who makes the war on poverty possible. The amendment offered by the Senators from Vermont and Pennsylvania would add \$925 million to the President's budget in this fiscal year. I have heard it said that this would be an improvement upon the committee-reported version of title II because it would involve \$1.875 billion less than the committee version. However, the cost to the taxpayer in this

fiscal year would be only \$375 million less than the committee-approved version. If it is the intention or hope of our distinguished colleagues from Vermont and Pennsylvania to sweeten the taste of title II in this fashion, I am compelled to say that few, if any, of our taxpaying constituents can hope to find the taste of an additional \$925 million, on top of an absolutely unprecedented peacetime deficit, to be sweet.

To approve any version of title II which I have yet heard suggested would be to make the entire war on poverty even more vulnerable than it already is with both the American public and with Congress. It is simply no answer, Mr. President, to the extravagance proposed in the committee-reported version of title II to instead propose to break the administration's budget ceiling by \$925 million at precisely the moment we are urging the administration to cut back on nondefense expenditures. In other words, this amendment is no cure to the committee version of title II.

Finally, Mr. President, it is clear that both the committee version of title II and that preferred by the sponsors of the pending amendment must be rejected on the grounds that neither version has been the subject of the thorough hearings traditionally required in this body prior to a commitment to a vast new domestic program. In fact, they have not been subject to any hearings at all. We have no clear idea of exactly how the so-called emergency employment program will work or exactly how it would related to—or perhaps duplicate and confuse—existing employment programs. We have no evidence that the so-called Human Investment Act would really be effective in reaching and benefiting those most in need of employment assistance. In any event, it would be unthinkable to commit ourselves to either of these alternative versions of title II without the benefit of the most extensive hearings and the most careful deliberation at the committee level.

Mr. President, for all the reasons which commend themselves to me, and I am sure to most of my distinguished colleagues, with great force, I urge that the pending amendment be rejected.

If the Prouty amendment is agreed to, then the motion which I have offered—the effect of which would be to delete title II—would be out of the question, because the question would then recur on my motion as amended by Senator PROUTY's substitute. My motion would no longer be amendable.

Therefore, I hope Senators will support me in rejecting the Prouty amendment to my motion so that we can reach a clear-cut final vote on my motion to recommit with instructions to delete title II in its entirety.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. As I understand it, if the Prouty amendment is defeated, the question will recur on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to strike title II.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. The purpose of the Sen-

ator's amendment to strike title II is to enable the war on poverty to continue without making it an all-out war on the American taxpayer.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, and may I reiterate that, if the Prouty amendment is rejected, the vote will recur on my motion to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith with title II deleted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I ask the Senator if it might not be possible to obtain some sort of agreement that we would vote on the Byrd motion first? My thought is that it would be logical to permit Senators who would simply like to vote for the big reduction provided in the Byrd motion to do so. If it does not carry, then we can vote on motions that would provide for lesser reductions. I wonder if it might be possible to arrange votes in that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 30 seconds.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no time left.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, both sides get 30 seconds, then.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Could it be agreed that we would have an opportunity to vote for the larger reduction first, and then, if that fails to carry, that we could vote for lesser reduction?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont would have precedence over the vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would the Senator from Vermont be willing to let us vote on the Byrd motion first, and then vote on the Prouty motion, in the event the Byrd motion fails?

Mr. PROUTY. No; if the Senator will yield, I think we have a clear-cut issue here, and should just follow through on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Vermont has 6 minutes remaining. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I recognize we are not likely to convince anybody of anything in 1 minute. I am the coauthor, with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] of the basic measure, but I believe that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has now sharpened and refined it in a way which is satisfactory to me, and I hope to Senator CLARK, and we support it.

Mr. President, the essence of the finding being made by the Senate, if it agrees to this amendment, is twofold:

First, we would be finding, by our vote, that jobs are the basis for dealing with the major national crisis in the slums and ghettos, and that there is no other basic and direct way to meet it; that the slums and ghettos need this application of help—which is sustained by three high-level commissions of the President appointed in 1966 and 1967, as well as, in my judgment, by every whit of the evidence before the committee on which I have the honor to serve with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and others.

Second, Mr. President, the Senate would be finding that the crisis of the cities deserves, in the interests of the tranquillity and morale of the country, the priority which we would thus be giving it.

For those reasons, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope that all Senators who intended to vote for the original Emergency Employment Act will support the unanimous view of the Democratic members of the subcommittee by voting for the Prouty amendment.

The Prouty amendment is the result of some intensive discussion between members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle. In my opinion, if Senators wish to do something for the poor in the cities, they will vote for the Prouty amendment, and not throw their votes away on a futile effort to pass the Emergency Employment Act as it came to the floor.

With the support of those on this side of the aisle who supported the committee on the Emergency Employment Act, I have some confidence that the Prouty amendment can be adopted.

I believe the Prouty amendment would do almost as much as can realistically be expected to be done in this fiscal year to get jobs for those in the cities who so badly need them. A vote for the Prouty amendment is a vote for an effective program in the war against poverty.

In conclusion, I point out that this is an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill. No one can tell how much it will cost the taxpayers of America, if anything, until the appropriating process has been completed. The rural part of this bill is just as important as the urban part. The rural ghettos, the delta counties, will receive their share of benefits.

I hope that the Prouty amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 2 minutes remaining. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have put on each Senator's desk a thumbnail sketch of what my amendment will accomplish.

First, it would reduce the \$2.8 billion authorization in title II of the bill to \$875 million, plus \$50 million for interest-free

loans which is repayable. That is a reduction of about \$1.875 billion.

It would permit the Secretary of Labor to use up to \$328,125,000 for human investment training programs run by private industry, which have been demonstrated to be the most effective type of job-training programs conducted thus far.

It would also permit the Secretary to use up to \$175 million for on-the-job training and other vocational and institutional training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

It would require the Secretary of Labor to give priority in filling all employment and job training openings created by title II programs to unemployed and low-income persons in the poverty category who are heads of families. Thus, a total of \$503,125,000 can be used by the Secretary for on-the-job and institutional training, designed to enable these people to acquire the skills to become productive.

This is a proposal which solicits the cooperation of industry; and under this proposal, I am sure that management and labor will cooperate with the Secretary of Labor to make this a successful program.

I realize that some people are unemployable, and that the Government, as the employer of last resort, will have to take care of them through job creation. I agree that it is far better to make some kind of jobs for them than to keep them on the welfare rolls. However, the main emphasis and thrust of my amendment is on training such people when and where they are trainable so that they can obtain the necessary skills to fill productive jobs in the private sector of our economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that each side be allowed 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention again to these facts:

First. The activities that the Senators seek to have performed may largely be performed under present authority.

Second. No hearings have been held on this amendment or on title II of the bill.

Third. Title II was not requested by the administration.

Fourth. The shortcomings of the already-existing poverty programs should be corrected before we engage upon a new and costly venture.

Fifth. Even though the Prouty amendment purports to cut the authorization under title II, in reality it would only be reduced from \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 1968 to \$925 million—a reduction of only \$325 million.

If we agree to the Prouty amendment, we will be saddling the taxpayers with a program which will cost at least \$925 million and which has not been requested by the administration. So while the amendment appears to be making a cut, in reality it is authorizing \$925 million

that has not been requested by the administration and which will further increase the budget deficit if moneys are later appropriated.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, if we agree to the Prouty amendment, we shall be making it possible for a good many people who are now unemployable to receive training which will take them off the relief rolls. If that is not saving money for the taxpayers, I do not know what is. My amendment would cut by nearly \$2 billion the authorization as proposed when the measure first came to the Senate floor.

I yield such time as I have remaining to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I spent all of yesterday morning at a poverty conference, where I heard leaders of the poverty-stricken people of this country. I believe that the adoption of this amendment would save the taxpayers many times the initial cost of the Prouty amendment, because I know the poverty-stricken people of this country are looking to Congress to give them the program the Prouty amendment proposes. Certainly they recognize it is not in the administration bill; that is why this great effort is being made by the poverty-stricken people of this country to call attention to their plight and to seek to obtain the help for which they plead.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the committee report on the Emergency Employment Act includes ample documentation of the fact that its goal—jobs—is an absolute necessity in any solution to what we have come to recognize as the crisis of the cities.

The suggestion by Mayor Lindsay of New York last year that his city will need a 10-year Federal outlay of some \$50 billion, and the interpolation of that figure into a \$1,000 billion national requirement, shocked many of us into a new awareness of the crushing problems of decaying housing, woefully inadequate public facilities and services, and human despair that are plaguing our urban areas.

The availability of meaningful employment can attack these problems at all levels. A job can change dependency into dignity, and can build toward a lifetime of self-sufficiency for people who might alternatively spend all of their days on public assistance. Moreover, under the provisions of this bill, the jobs will be in the fulfillment of important public needs that would otherwise not be met.

At the same time, I think it is highly important to pay attention to the location of the jobs that will be created. Employment is needed in the cities by people who are there now. But we should also consider this legislation in light of the fact that some 600,000 Americans are migrating from the countryside to urban areas each year in search of work opportunities. The limited number of jobs it will create will clearly accomplish little in remedying existing urban unemployment if that heavy migration continues at the present rate.

Some 47 percent of the native South Dakotans who were living in 1960, for

example, were residing in other States—a total of 430,194 people. By far, the largest proportionate share of them went to urban areas such as Los Angeles and San Francisco in California, which received 98,854 native South Dakotans, or Minneapolis-St. Paul in Minnesota, which was the destination of 53,749 people who left my State.

These people sought opportunities elsewhere primarily because of decreasing agricultural opportunities and corresponding business declines in small towns and cities. The process is continuing today.

These people may have found jobs. If so, they took the place of people who made up the internal population growth of the cities. If not, they and others like them from all parts of rural America are among the urban unemployed. In either case, they compounded both the physical and human problems of the cities that have their roots in overcrowding.

I do not believe that the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 can have its maximum beneficial impact unless some of the assistance it provides is directed toward stemming migration from the rural States to urban centers. I believe we need to do what we can to prevent further population shifts that add to the congestion of our cities.

The bill does recognize this need by calling for new jobs in both rural and urban areas. However, precisely because outmigration occurs, most rural areas would probably not be able to qualify under the criteria it uses for establishing areas that are eligible for assistance—chiefly unemployment and underemployment. A slow rate of economic growth, or even an actual drop in employment such as occurred in my State between 1950 and 1960, is usually not reflected by higher unemployment rates because those who cannot find work migrate to the cities.

To overcome this problem, I have offered an amendment which would add "problems of outmigration" as a factor to be considered along with unemployment, underemployment, and a high proportion of low-income people as a factor to be considered by the Secretary of Labor. This would have the effect of extending the benefits of the bill to rural States such as South Dakota. I am pleased that Senator PROUTY, of Vermont, a senior Republican member of the committee, is incorporating my amendment in his proposed revision of the bill.

Let me stress that, since migration is recognized as a problem that aggravates urban unemployment in the bill, my amendment in effect would merely bring the operative provisions of the bill more in line with its findings and declarations.

Mr. President, a job training program of this kind is in the interest of the American taxpayer because it will take people off the welfare rolls and train them for private industry. It will also take idle men off the streets where they provide the grist for costly violence, riots, and crime. The present system which relies so heavily on the welfare dole, is costly and ineffective. I want to see these financial and human costs reduced, and the best way to do that is through good

job training efforts. I also want the rural and small-town youth who are now leaving my State to be encouraged instead to stay with us. That can only be possible if we step up the job training and job opportunities in our rural States, which this program as revised by my amendment would help to do.

Senator PROUTY's version of the bill is considerably more modest than the committee version. I support it as a prudent, less costly version of the job training bill. I support it because it relies more heavily on private industry to carry out job training. I support it because it takes into consideration rural States as well as urban areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. INOUE (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROYA] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced as follows—yeas 42, nays 47:

[No. 275 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Aiken	Clark	Harris
Boggs	Cooper	Hart
Brewster	Dirksen	Hatfield
Brooke	Fong	Jackson
Case	Griffin	Javits
Church	Gruening	Kennedy, Mass.

Kennedy, N.Y.	Mondale	Prouty
Kuchel	Morse	Randolph
Long, Mo.	Morton	Ribicoff
Magnuson	Muskie	Scott
McCarthy	Nelson	Tydings
McGee	Pearson	Williams, N.J.
McGovern	Pell	Yarborough
Metcalf	Percy	Young, Ohio

NAYS—47

Allott	Fulbright	Miller
Anderson	Hansen	Monroney
Bennett	Hartke	Mundt
Bible	Hayden	Murphy
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Smathers
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Smith
Cannon	Hollings	Sparkman
Carlson	Hruska	Spong
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Symington
Dodd	Lausche	Talmadge
Dominick	Long, La.	Thurmond
Eastland	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—11

Baker	Gore	Pastore
Bartlett	Inouye	Russell
Bayh	Montoya	Tower
Ervin	Moss	

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment:

H.J. Res. 853. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 580).

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed immediately to consideration of House Joint Resolution 853, which is an amendment to the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1968.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. This amendment, as it passed the House Tuesday, October 3, 1967, merely provides for the extension until October 10, 1967, of the existing provision of the first continuing resolution under which governmental activities without their regular annual appropriation have operated since June 30, 1967.

The committee recommends that the House resolution be amended to extend the termination date of the continuing resolution to October 23, 1967. The date provided for in the House-passed version is October 10, which is only 4 working days from today.

Four of the fiscal year 1968 appropriation bills, Interior, Treasury-Post Office, Legislative, and Defense, have been enacted into law. In addition, two fiscal year 1967 appropriation bills have been signed into law: the second supplemental and the Defense supplemental. The Agriculture and Independent Offices appropriation bills are in conference while the Labor-HEW conference report has been agreed to and filed.

The State, Justice, Commerce, and judiciary appropriation bill, the Transportation appropriation bill, the Public Works appropriation bill, and the NASA appropriation bill are on the Senate Calendar.

There is one appropriation bill in the Committee on Appropriations—the District of Columbia bill. Hearings have been virtually completed on this bill. The remaining three appropriation bills, foreign aid, military construction, and the supplemental, are in the House Committee on Appropriations awaiting authorization.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOMB in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 5, after the word "thereof", strike out "October 10, 1967" and insert "October 23, 1967".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I believe that a joint resolution of this nature should be considered in a little less hubbub, so that Senators will know what they are voting on.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. This is the joint resolution which was passed by the House of Representatives to continue the appropriations at present levels until October 10. The Senate should be aware that this is a most unusual step. Normally, in traditional times, when we are not flirting with bankruptcy, we pass such joint resolutions—

Mr. DOMINICK. May we have order, Mr. President? I cannot hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attaches will please take their seats. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MUNDT. Normally, when we are not flirting with bankruptcy and court-ing financial disaster, we merely pass continuing resolutions a month or so at a time, when dilatory tactics in one body or the other delay the timely passage of appropriations bills and when meeting only from Tuesdays to Thursdays in the month of October tends to keep us here forever to get little business done. But these are not normal times, except that we still continue with our abbreviated workweeks, which I believe is wrong. Except for that, there is nothing normal about these times. We are in war.

Our financial problem is very serious. The administration is now trying to impose another 10-percent levy on the taxpayers. We are confronted with a \$29 billion deficit, perhaps more.

So there was a reason why the House,

in a rollcall vote, extended the present level of appropriations for only 10 days; and there is a reason why a collateral action was taken by the Ways and Means Committee, when it said, in effect, "We are not going to consider tax increases at all or have another committee meeting unless and until either the President or Congress, or both, show us where some cuts can be made in the expenditures." That is the unusual feature of this matter as it comes before us today.

So when the resolution came to the Senate committee, it did not seem quite right merely to keep the same 10-day level approved by the House because by the time the joint resolution gets through and is on the President's desk, only 4 or 5 days might be left. But it did seem to many of us that it was entirely wrong to consider the resolution as just an ordinary extension of expenditures; because if we are to effectuate some economies, we should be working on them this week, right now, and not continue to spend until the end of October at the same old reckless level.

We had quite a little discussion in the committee. It was proposed by the President, and recommended by the President's spokesman on the committee, that the extension be continued until November 10. That would be normal, in normal times. It was finally suggested that the time be shortened a little, to the end of October. Some of us felt that it should be October 10, but that such action today might be a little unrealistic in getting the desired results.

Finally, as a substitute for the longer extension which was before us, I suggested that we extend the time only to Monday, October 23, because Sunday is the 22d and Saturday is the 21st, and unless Congress changes its habits—it does not meet much on Friday any more; and if it does, it does not usually vote—we would have only until the 20th, which would allow only 10 days beyond the House action. So my motion was adopted, I believe unanimously, but certainly without any dissenting votes, and the Senate should approve it here today. But I believe we should approve it with the recognition that it commits us and supports the House and applauds the move in the direction of some additional economizing.

We nearly voted almost a billion additional dollars this morning on a proposal that had never even had a hearing. No Senator who voted for it—except perhaps the author—knows exactly what was in it, and yet in the recent rollcall it was narrowly defeated.

We say we do not want tax increases; we do not want to belabor the poor taxpayer. But the Senate nearly said, "Here goes a billion dollars more." Actually, had we failed to defeat that proposal, the consequent upsurge of inflation would have oppressed and harassed the poverty stricken much more than they would have been aided by the near billion dollar new expenditures for untried programs.

Let us get serious about this matter of inflation. The time has come for some belt tightening, for some rescission measures; and the time has come for the watchdogs of the Treasury, if any re-

main, to remember, every time we now pass an appropriation bill, that it is for 9 months. We can cut back 25 percent on all the increases, effectuate economy, yet change nothing in the activity rate, because we are legislating now for only 9 months, appropriating for 9 months, but we continue to appropriate on a 12-month basis, while only 9 months remain in the fiscal year.

This is October. So far as I know, this session of Congress apparently never intends to adjourn. I see no activity stirring up. We do not meet in the evenings, we do not meet on Saturdays, we do not vote on Fridays, and sometimes we discontinue our work on Thursdays. That is not my responsibility. I am not the leadership. However, there are some economies we should effectuate and look at since we are not very busy at other jobs.

Somebody at the other end of the avenue and Members of this body and of the other body should remember that we are now committing ourselves as a group to try to do some economizing. That is what this very unusual, short term continuing resolution is all about.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been interested in what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has just said about a so-called abbreviated workweek in the Senate. I respectfully challenge the Senator's characterization and refer him to the fact that the record just does not bear him out—there have been no such abbreviated weeks in the Senate. I cite as my proof, in addition to my actual knowledge, and I am sure it is the Senate's actual knowledge, too, that up through October 1, the Senate had been in session 150 days, and during that time had been in session 783 hours and 36 minutes which is nearly 6 hours a day; in comparison with the other body which had been in session for 140 days, and the time in session had been 611 hours and 40 minutes.

I say to my distinguished colleague from South Dakota, the Senate has not been operating on a Tuesday-to-Thursday basis. We have been meeting on Saturdays, when necessary, but fortunately, thanks to the cooperation of the Senate as a whole, the calendar has remained relatively clear up to the present time. I am sure that a close investigation of the record will show that the Senate has been equally productive in disposing of legislation on Mondays and Fridays as on the other days of the week.

Insofar as the proposal to pass the buck to the President on this matter of expenditures is concerned, I would point out that we have a far greater responsibility than does the President; our responsibility is prescribed by the Constitution and if we are afraid to face up to that responsibility, we should not pass the buck to him.

I would point out also that over the past several months, the President has requested the leadership time and time again to please get the appropriation bills to him as soon as possible so that after

determining where the Congress wanted emphasis, he could apply the scalpel and belt tightening and see where additional cuts may be made. But the task will not be easy. The figure within which to work is something like \$21 billion. Is he going to cut out defense expenditures in excess of \$70 billion? He cannot touch \$13 billion we are paying in interest today. He should not touch veterans benefits. What he has done has been to make recommendations based on laws passed by the Congress which call for appropriations, as well as authorizations. So I think that really it is our responsibility and not the President's; I think it is up to us here in the Congress to take the initiative on this matter.

There are four appropriation bills on the calendar now, including the NASA appropriation, which was reported by the full committee yesterday and appears on the calendar today. It will be some time before these bills reach the White House for signing; all of them are going to generate some debate and thorough consideration. The President should be given this opportunity to try to excise what he can out of the appropriation bills. But at the same time Congress must face up to its responsibility and cut out projects and appropriations which may not be deemed worthy and indeed, essential. In that respect I will be just as diligent as any Senator in fighting for appropriations for my State. However, I think collectively we should face up to our responsibility—our responsibility under the Constitution—to the end that this difficulty, which could well develop into a political donnybrook, could be forestalled and settled.

This matter of the continuing appropriations was discussed, as the Senator from South Dakota pointed out, in the Committee on Appropriations this morning. Various suggestions were made: to agree to the House date of October 10, to agree to a date of October 25, or to agree to a date of October 31—which I advocated by the way. Finally, in an effort to reach unanimous agreement, the committee agreed to the date proposed by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who now has the floor.

It is true that we do face troublous times in this Nation today; in my opinion, the most troublous times in the history of our Republic. There is a very difficult situation in Vietnam. There is urban unrest in our cities. We face the possibility of a \$29 billion or \$30 billion deficit for this fiscal year; and even if the President's proposal is agreed to and a tax increase of something on the order of \$7 billion or \$8 billion is forthcoming, it will cause little more than a dent in this deficit.

If the position of the President prevails and the appropriation bills he sought are enacted, and if we do not go beyond the expenditures he recommends, it is his hope that between \$4 and \$5 billion will be saved. I say: Stay as close to his budget as possible, give him his chance, and let us face our responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to say to my distinguished friend that what he said pretty well reiterates the point of view I expressed. I find nothing that

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1884. An act for the relief of Virgile Posfay;

H.R. 2283. An act for the relief of Dr. Ray F. McMillan;

H.R. 3727. An act for the relief of Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo;

H.R. 6096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; and

H.R. 10932. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired).

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1884. An act for the relief of Virgile Posfay;

H.R. 2283. An act for the relief of Dr. Ray F. McMillan;

H.R. 3727. An act for the relief of Elpidio Dimacali Damazo and Natividad Simsuangco Damazo;

H.R. 6096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton; and

H.R. 10932. An act for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 2, 1967, pp. H12773-H12782, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 11722, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968, and in connection therewith, I have a brief statement I should like to make.

The report was signed by all the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives and the Senate and has now been agreed to by the House.

The sum total of the bill as agreed to in conference is \$2,333,255,000. This amount is only \$51,446,000 above the amount approved by the Senate and \$75,551,000 below the amount approved by the House. The action of the conferees resulted in a decrease in the Department's request of \$327,128,000 for a reduction of almost 12.5 percent.

As may be seen from the small increase above the amount approved by the Senate, the Senate position prevailed in most every instance. This may be further emphasized by the fact that the Senate conferees accepted a provision contained in the House-passed bill to provide \$60 million for NATO infrastructure which was in the bill that passed the House but not in the Senate bill. The bill as presented to the Congress this year contained a section authorizing the Secretary of Defense to carry out bilateral and multilateral arrangements with foreign governments for sharing the costs of acquiring and construction of military facilities and installations, including military headquarters, for collective defense. Although the original bill did not so state, the arrangements relate to NATO and the money figure, which was not set out in the bill, was \$60 million.

The House properly modified this language to place authority in the Secretary of the Army which is, in fact, the executive agency for this construction; limited the cost to NATO; and inserted the specific money figure of \$60 million which is the anticipated expenditure for these purposes during the coming year. The Senate committee, taking note of the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee granted similar authority for the NATO infrastructure in the foreign aid bill, deleted the proposed authority from the military construction authorization bill. As of this time, however, the conference between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee has not been completed. Therefore, the Senate conferees felt compelled to include this provision in the bill. Otherwise, the total amount agreed upon by the conference would have been below the Senate figure.

While some minor adjustments were made within the requirements of the three military departments, I shall mention only one of them, namely, the Navy request for \$1,135,000 to provide for a new laundry and dry cleaning plant at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md. The Senate denied this item in the belief that the building was overdesigned and entirely too expensive. Subsequently, a letter was received from the Department of

the Navy indicating that this request might be reduced to \$953,000 for a reduction of \$182,000. Nevertheless, the conferees on the part of the House insisted on the original amount. This is a reduction of approximately 16 percent although the Navy frankly admits the unit construction cost of \$17.85 per square foot is considered by them to be equivalent to approximately \$13.50 per square foot for a commercially built facility, or some 32 percent higher. The Senate conferees acquiesced with the understanding that this discrepancy would be called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations in order that they might give this matter due consideration in providing the funds for this project.

Next, I should like to mention the \$200 million contingency fund requested by the Secretary of Defense for his use, primarily in southeast Asia. In considering the bill, the House reduced this amount to \$150 million and earmarked \$50 million of the remainder to be used on road construction. The conferees finally agreed to a reduction of \$50 million in the amount requested, none of which is earmarked for any purpose.

Finally, I should like to refer to title VI of the bill which relates to military family housing. It is to be recalled that the Department requested the construction of 12,500 new units of family housing and the Senate reduced by 2,816 the number of units requested. Of the number deleted, the conferees agreed to restore 725 units, bringing the total number of units authorized to 10,409, for an increase of \$14,552,000 above the amount approved by the Senate. I am happy to state, however, that several language provisions inserted in the bill by the Senate, which would give the Congress better control over the family housing program, were accepted by the conferees.

Mr. President, I believe that I have fairly summarized the action taken by the conference committee and I feel confident that the construction needs of the military departments and the Defense agencies have been adequately provided for for fiscal year 1968, and I shall be happy to answer any questions.

I make my motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question recurs on S. 2388, the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to recommit the bill with instructions.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on my motion to recommit with instructions be withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of several Senators on this side of the aisle who thought we should vote, I would have to object at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we understand the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], to recommit title II, take place at 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be charged equally to the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] whose motion is now pending.

I would ask the attachés on both sides of the aisle to notify all Senators about the vote at 1 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may be entitled to.

The very close vote, 47 to 42, by which the Prouty amendment was defeated was strong indication to me, particularly in view of the strong support from the Republican side of the aisle the Prouty amendment achieved, that it will not be many months before the Senate is prepared to face up to the problem of doing something effective for the poor people in our urban and rural ghettos in terms of giving them useful employment and thereby placing them on the tax rolls.

As a matter of fact, the vote was closer than the record indicates, because the two Senators who gave pairs were prepared to support the Prouty amendment if their votes would have made any difference.

I am not unaware of the fact that on the record vote which will take place in less than half an hour there will be an appearance of many Senators falling away from their compassionate interest in the poor people of America. The arguments which have been made with respect to no hearings on the bill, and the fiscal implications of a \$2.8 billion authorization to put poor people to work, have an appeal to many Senators. There has been a curious sort of turning away from the suggestion that the swollen military appropriations, which are the

principal cause of the fiscal problems we face, should be cut.

I would like to say that, as far as I am concerned, those who are committed to vote for the Clark Emergency Employment Act are released from commitments. I shall vote against the motion to strike. I would urge my colleagues who were prepared to support me in this regard to use their own judgment, because the critical vote was the vote which took place a little while ago. What was the high water mark for those who have a keen and abiding interest in the fate of the poor people of our country and seek to give it the highest consideration to which it is entitled. But I shall vote against the Byrd amendment because I believe deeply in the Emergency Employment Act, and I want to be so recorded.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, I have high regard and great respect for the Senator from West Virginia. He is just as dedicated in his support of his amendment as I am in opposition to it. We just have honest differences of opinion. I cannot support the Byrd amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Neither can I.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not support the Byrd amendment. The Senator from Pennsylvania, in his typical fairness and graciousness, has made clear that because the vote on the Prouty amendment really was the key vote, therefore he was releasing any Senators who might think that they had committed themselves to the Senator from Pennsylvania. This is typical of the Senator from Pennsylvania. But I shall vote against the Byrd amendment on the merits as I see the merits. I may be wrong, but I feel that way.

I did not get the chance, in the minute that I had to discuss the Prouty amendment, to call attention to an experience I had yesterday that I am never going to forget, in hearing what I think is typical of the views of the poverty-stricken people of this country. I spent yesterday morning in a poverty workshop in my State. My State is not one that is characterized—I see the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] on the floor—with the kind of problems that exist in Chicago or Philadelphia or Pittsburgh or Newark or Detroit or in the other great metropolitan areas of the country.

I listened to this poverty spokesman from the ranks of poverty. In my judgment, if we do not have the crash program that the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the other Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and other Senators on the floor are fighting for, the taxpayers in the time ahead are going to lose many times the cost of that crash program as a result of what is going to occur in this country in the troubled spots.

I yield to no one on law and order, but let us face it, the poverty-stricken people of this country are not going to see the degradation forced upon them that is being forced upon them while we spend

over \$75 billion around the world, only \$22 billion of which in the present defense bill is Vietnam-connected.

The taxpayers will have to face up to the fact that the poverty-stricken people of this country recognize that we cannot justify that kind of appropriation for defense in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

I just came out of a meeting with the House on the appropriations bill in regard to military aid. There is talk that if we do not make supersonic bombers available to South America, they will go to France. Blackmail. Let them go, but also let us make clear that they are not going to get cooperation from the United States in regard to other programs. First things have to come first.

One of the first things facing the American taxpayers is that we have to meet the crisis in the poverty-stricken ghettos of America or they will pay several times the money they think they are going to save by the vote already taken here this morning and by the vote, if the Byrd amendment should pass, to be taken, which in effect will table it. That is what it means.

Does anyone think we are going to get any action on this matter before we adjourn? This is a motion, not by intent but by result, that is going to mean the postponement of consideration of this matter until we reconvene in January. That is too late. Now is the time, this is the hour, in which we have to live up to what I think—speaking of my own personal philosophy—is my responsibility to the poverty-stricken people of this country to meet the most serious domestic problem in our body politic.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with everything the Senator has said. We know there are three serious problems confronting the country today which are giving the President grave concern. They have been discussed around here day after day.

They are, in my opinion, first, the war in Vietnam, which carries with it a swollen military appropriation pressed through the Congress by the military-industrial-scientific establishment—an unconscionable amount of money.

The second is the enormous deficit which we are facing, which is going to require the flotation of \$30 billion of Federal bonds next year to meet the deficit.

The third is the plight of the cities.

So far it is the point of view of the Senate that the plight of the cities and the urban ghettos comes last. We are in a dilemma as to what to do about a tax increase and the deficit. That particular problem has not been solved.

There is only one way to solve this problem, and that is to cut the military budget. The only way is for Congress to unwrap itself from phony patriotism and talk about protecting our boys by providing billions of dollars for the industrial lobby, and to put some commonsense into the economic policy of the United States.

I hope that day will come soon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one sentence?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I think

the problem will be resolved next November at the ballot boxes, by the American people who will do the voting. They are going to put first things first; and they know that a \$70 billion defense budget, the largest in the history of the Republic, is not putting first things first.

Mr. CLARK. If I may say also to my friends from Illinois and Oregon, who are among the small group on the floor of the Senate now—as is not unusual in the Senate—this fight to get some money for jobs for the unemployed in our rural and urban ghettos is just beginning. The Senator is probably correct; we probably cannot bring a bill to the floor before the end of this session. But a bill will be introduced, and hearings will be held, and every member of the Urban Coalition who says we need enough emergency employment funds to create 1 million jobs—not the 200,000 jobs that this modest proposal calls for—will have an opportunity to come in and testify. We will mark up the bill, and get it on the Calendar before we adjourn.

This fight, my friends, is just beginning; and the vote we are about to have is a very small skirmish in a very long war, which in the end will be won.

I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I just called the Department of Labor to obtain figures for unemployment in an area across the river from Illinois, in the principle Negro community of St. Louis.

The latest survey they had taken was in November 1966, but they maintain that they have no reason to believe the figures are any different today.

Their figures show that in Northside St. Louis, which is largely a Negro slum area, unemployment was 12.9 percent, overall; but that in this great country of ours, at the height of a period of sustained prosperity, the rate of unemployment there among teenagers aged 16 to 19 years is 40 percent. I have no reason to believe that that figure is too far off from the condition in my own State, in the area of East St. Louis across the river.

In August 1967, nationally nonwhite teenage unemployment was 26.6 percent, compared to 11.7 percent for white teenagers. As a rule of thumb, I am told that white teenagers have roughly four times the unemployment rate of the total labor force, which is now 3.8 percent, but nonwhite teenagers have a rate roughly twice that of white teenagers.

I think we face a very critical condition. Certainly, when we look at the billion-dollar expense that lies in the rubble of Detroit and the rubble of Newark, when we look at figures such as we are talking about now, looking back on the destructive cost of not having done something before this, is it not about time that we do something to prevent these things in the future, and not wait for the long hot summer next year, but recognize that the bitterness and the frustration of the unemployed and the idle is just as great in times of cool weather as it is in hot weather? That frustration, I submit, exists the year round.

I have struggled, in my own mind, with this problem, because I, too, know from weeks of hearings in the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the

Banking and Currency Committee and in the Subcommittee on Urban Affairs of the Joint Economic Committee, that the testimony that comes to us is irrefutable, from the academicians, business leaders, civic leaders, and others who come before us, who say that frustration and despair comes from inadequate education, poor housing, and lack of jobs. Unless we do something about it, this country can be torn asunder and divided by the haves and the have-nots. If we can finance a multi-billion-dollar foreign aid program for other people in other lands, we can certainly think in terms that such programs being undertaken at home.

I am impressed with one other fact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, if he would be willing to yield the Senator from Illinois 2 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield 2 minutes.

Mr. PERCY. I am impressed with the fact that the unemployed are supported now by relief measures just as my own family was in the midst of the great depression. We were on relief. We received a stipend from the Government; a food truck came by and dropped off parcels. It cost the public something to keep our family from starving in those days.

Then a WPA work project came along, and the Illinois Symphony Orchestra was created. My mother was a violinist, and she went from a relief roll to a payroll—to be sure, a public payroll, but I will never forget the sense of dignity she had, walking out with a violin under her arm, to go to play in a school for children—and that orchestra toured the Chicago area, performing for the public and for schoolchildren who had never heard a symphony orchestra; and all of the musicians in it, who had been on relief or welfare before, were now usefully employed. While the cost to the public was the same—

Mr. CLARK. That was the WPA, was it not?

Mr. PERCY. That was the WPA.

Mr. CLARK. A much maligned program.

Mr. PERCY. A much maligned program, and there is no question about it, there were flaws and holes in it. But, as a young boy, I can remember the difference between idleness, sitting at home doing nothing and taking a handout, and having a job and feeling you are contributing something.

We are not going to let people starve in this country. I think that is what we are up against right now. I am a fiscal conservative. I never had an unbalanced budget in my life—public life, private life, or business—until I arrived in Washington in January. There has been nothing but red ink since then.

So in dealing with this issue also I have tried to take the most fiscally responsible route. The first route was the 2 percent plan, under the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and myself, whereby we established an Emergency Employment Fund without any new funds being ap-

propriated. The second was private employment, under the Prouty amendment. I must say that the measure before us now is my third choice. It would provide public jobs—but public jobs, not public welfare; and I would always prefer a job ahead of welfare—a helping hand instead of giving a demeaning handout.

I support the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy. I support the motion to recommit the pending bill and to strike title II thereof.

I also think that title I should be given further consideration by the Senate and that some advice and counsel should be obtained from an appropriate authority, perhaps the Senate Finance Committee, as to the demands this bill would add to our already strained sources of revenue.

More and more Senate procedure has become a practice of authorizing Federal programs on the basis of the benefits to the beneficiaries of the program proposed. Too little consideration has been given to the burden these programs place on the taxpayer.

We must weigh and judge programs we approve not only from the standpoint of the good that might be done for society, but also from the standpoint of whether our society can afford the cost required to support them.

The taxpayer, Mr. President, as a citizen, is also entitled to equal treatment by Congress, and to have his day in court. I am certainly in sympathy with people who are in poverty, and willing for the Government to help them some, if they try to help themselves, or to administer to those who are unable. But the Senator from Pennsylvania—and he and I have worked together on many matters—stated that they intend to get this money anyway, in greater sums. I believe they will, in astronomical sums, unless at some point Congress calls a halt to its present trend.

This bill, as now reported, provides for \$5.05 billion, or 150 percent more than was requested in the President's budget. It authorizes \$3.4 billion, or over 300 percent more than was appropriated last year. This big additional demand for more money comes at a time when all expenditures are sharply rising, revenues are falling below estimates, the deficit is growing, rapidly, and additional new multi-billion-dollar military programs are being started.

Last year's total appropriations were well above those of the year before. This year's requests are well above last year's.

Revenues to meet these expenditures are considerably less than anticipated. When the budget came to Congress in January it was estimated that in the coming year we would collect \$126.9 billion. Now that estimate has dropped to \$122.5 billion.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I have very little time remaining, but out of courtesy I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he does not really believe that the place to make such a cut would be in the military budget.

Mr. STENNIS. The last major military appropriation bill from the Appropriations Committee did have a sizable reduction. As I said then, we felt it was not cutting the bone and the muscle from the military program, nor from the war effort. I believe that continued effort can save even more money from that source.

The deficit continues to grow at a much more rapid rate than predicted. In fiscal 1967 the actual deficit was five times higher than predicted when the budget was presented. The deficit this year was estimated at the outset to be four times the predicted deficit of last year, and the most current estimates indicate that it may be six to 13 times higher than the predicted deficit of last year, depending upon what happens with regard to a tax increase.

Moreover we are at war. While there is no doubt we will obtain a victory or a negotiated peace on honorable terms, the time and the cost required to do so is highly uncertain. We have reduced defense expenditures to the lowest limit possible without cutting into the bone and muscle of our military forces. We cut this year's Defense request by \$1.6 billion but some badly needed items were not requested and not enough was requested for others. As an example, we really need more pilots and other manpower, the Reserve Forces need additional equipment. One of the greatest handicaps in controlling the recent Detroit riots was the lack of transportation and communications equipment which the National Guard should have had but did not have. Some units had to charter commercial busses to get from their home towns to Detroit because they had no trucks available.

We will have to have additional money appropriated to pay for the direct cost of running the war.

We must put up an antiballistic missile defense to protect ourselves from Red China and from Russia or take the chance of having to yield to their threats and demands. This will cost many billions of dollars.

The load all the Federal programs now on the books has put on the taxpayer's back is already so heavy the average taxpayer can hardly stand up under it.

Before we pass another bill to authorize billions more of Federal expenditures, we should know what effect it will have on the taxpayer. That is why I think this bill should have more consideration. We cannot authorize a sum of money as large as that requested here without dipping deeply into the revenue now available. This bill, if passed, will put heavy additional demands upon our ability to pay for other needs and upon our sources of revenue. We need to know what effect these added demands will have, whether they will have to be met by new taxes, and if so what effect these new taxes might have on the economy generally, upon the individual taxpayer, and on the general financial condition of the country.

With all deference to those Senators who serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee that considers this bill—and I am one and take full responsibility for my part—it has had no full hearing in the lifetime of the program. The poverty program has always been in the supplemental bill and has been considered in the very last days of the session. Last year, for example, the \$1.6 billion appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity was examined in a hearing that lasted less than 3 hours. The bill was marked up the next day and taken up on the floor of the Senate and passed the day after that—just 2 days before the Senate adjourned.

With all the demands on a Senator's time in the dying days of the session, it is impossible to give a \$1.5 billion program the kind of consideration it should be given. If that procedure is to be followed in this session, as it apparently will be, the error will be compounded by over 300 percent.

The taxpaying man and woman who has to foot the bill deserves to have this program given closer examination than it has been given in the past. When a Senator votes on this bill, he should have full knowledge of what he is doing to the taxpayer as well as what he is doing for the beneficiary under the program. By recommitting the bill to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, such action as is taken on the bill can be taken in light of all the facts, and each Senator will then be aware of the full consequences of his vote, not only on the people to be helped, but also on the people that have to do the helping.

As I understand, a new tax bill will be presented to the Senate partly on the basis of being necessary because of the cost of the war. In fact, I think it will be needed largely because of excessive nondefense expenditures, including this poverty program for the past 2 years, and because of the excessive authorizations provided in this bill.

The average person paying taxes in American is the so-called small taxpayer, but in proportion to his or her earnings or retirement benefit, these taxes are very large indeed. These taxpayers are already paying until it hurts, and they will resent paying more taxes. Unless they think their money is being spent for the necessities of the Government, there will be a revolt by the taxpayer at the polls.

This bill ought to be recommitted and I hope that it will be.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, once again, I would like to briefly outline the reasons which compel me to believe that it is our clear duty to delete title II from the pending bill. These reasons, which I expressed on yesterday, appear to me to so far outweigh the arguments in favor of title II which have been offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania and others that I am sure it will be the overwhelming consensus of this

body that the pending bill cannot be approved until it is shorn of title II.

First, Mr. President, the program proposed by this title would create half a million new jobs at a time when there are probably 1 million existing unfilled job openings in our economy and when there are 50,000 unfilled openings in MDTA projects in the Nation's 48 largest cities. Before we create another half million job openings, we clearly should concentrate on filling as many of these existing jobs and job training openings as possible. The problem is not a shortage of jobs in the United States, but rather a lack of qualified people to fill job openings and, in that respect, title II of this bill would go charging off in the wrong direction and at the wrong time.

Second, the jobs that this title would create would be what I have called pseudo-jobs. They would be, as I said yesterday, make-work jobs, shadow jobs, deadend jobs, jobs without a future, and jobs without the essential ingredients of meaningful employment. Such jobs would not only isolate the poor from the rest of society and freeze poverty into the proposed job categories, but would also make this body that much more vulnerable to charges of supporting Federal handouts, as well as hopelessly disrupt and undercut the President's carefully considered program for bringing greater job opportunities to the poor.

Mr. President, this crash program would crash right into a solid wall of public disapproval and by providing half a million leaf-raking assignments would contribute nothing to the national need for trained, skilled, and truly qualified workers.

Third, the program proposed by this title would be at odds with existing employment opportunity programs firmly supported by the administration which really can offer meaningful, purposeful, and career-oriented jobs. These administration programs, such as the Manpower Development and Training Act, which have already proved their success many times over in training or retraining people for better jobs, are the ones that we should give our support to, rather than going off halfcocked in search of new panaceas through ill-conceived and massively funded new programs.

Fourth, title II must be rejected because its provisions are so very vague, ambiguous, and unclear. Instead of being the product of careful and thorough study and consideration in the normal committee process, this program is urged upon us *de novo*, springing from the imagination of its sponsors. Rather than the product of exhaustive hearings, this program has been the subject of no hearings whatsoever. Even if the administration and the Congress were convinced that a real national emergency existed in this area, so as to justify an emergency program of the type here proposed, the underlying concepts as well as the working details of such a program would have to be set forth for our deliberation in far more concrete and far more carefully evaluated form than is the case here. Indeed, the manifest defects in this title have been called to our attention by four of our distinguished

colleagues, Senators DOMINICK, FANNON, MURPHY, and GRIFFIN, in supplemental views which they submitted to the committee report on this bill.

I am especially persuaded by Senator MURPHY's observation with regard to title II that—

Here, again, we seem to be faced with a lack of planning, a lack of definition, a lack of guidelines, and an absence of complete preparation. In good conscience, I cannot agree to spending \$2.8 billion of the taxpayers' dollars on such a program.

Fifth, and perhaps most important, is the fact that title II of this bill would have a tremendous inflationary impact on the economy at precisely the time when anti-inflationary measures are in order. As I pointed out yesterday, nearly \$3 billion poured indiscriminately into 500,000 jobs of very slight productivity must either give us a solid dose of new inflation or force the President and Congress to raise taxes even higher, and probably much higher, than now proposed. Now is not the time to add to an already fantastic national debt, or to increase an anticipated deficit for fiscal 1968, which the Secretary of the Treasury has estimated before the House Ways and Means Committee could go as high as \$29 billion. The additional \$1.3 billion required under this title for fiscal 1968 would not only compound this extremely dangerous deficit, but would also be a cruel blow to a President who is striving diligently to balance national needs against available limited national resources. This title would play havoc with the President's carefully considered and reasonably developed antipoverty budget and would be a grave disservice to the administration at a time of growing fiscal crisis.

Finally, Mr. President, as I said yesterday, this title raises extremely troublesome basic philosophical questions which I feel have got to be fully answered before we take a further step down the road proposed by title II. Is our country ready at this time to provide a subsidized and purposeless job to anyone who cannot or will not find work on his own? Where is the connection between such a program and truly productive, meaningful employment? How would we ever elevate people out of the make-work jobs this title would provide? If this program were enacted, would we not be creating a vast new public welfare bureaucracy? Can we justify to the American taxpayer paying up to half a million people for doing nothing productive, over the objections of the administration and contrary to our national economic situation and our priority commitment to victory in Vietnam? Can we ask the American taxpayers to assume the added and probably permanent public burden which this title would entail? Do we have the slightest idea where such a program would lead in the future except our knowledge, based upon abundant experience, that it would inevitably mushroom beyond all manageable bounds?

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 additional minutes allotted to each side and that the vote

which was to take place at 1 o'clock be delayed until 1:04 p.m.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator reserve that request?

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has just asked if I could yield him 1 minute. Could we make it 3 additional minutes?

Mr. GRUENING. Could we make it 5 minutes?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I modify my request and ask for 5 additional minutes to each side, and that the vote occur at 1:10 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, can we ask the American taxpayers to assume the added and probably permanent public burden which this title would entail? Do we have the slightest idea where such a program would lead in the future except our knowledge, based upon abundant experience, that it would inevitably mushroom beyond all manageable bounds?

Mr. President, it is abundantly clear to me, and I think to the decided majority of this body as well, that the sense of the American people and of their Congress today is that this program is both unnecessary and unwise. I, therefore, urge that my motion be accepted, so as to delete this ill-considered title from the pending bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a co-author, with Senator CLARK, of this bill, I consider it a matter of dignity and self-respect to rise in its defense.

I shall vote against recommitting the bill, and my reason, first, is that we now have a consensus in Congress, in my judgment, and in the country, that the key to dealing with the poverty program is jobs.

Second, this is a basic national crisis, tantamount to the crises which we face in Vietnam, and therefore is entitled to the highest priority. All the arguments made against it are the business-as-usual arguments. This is not business as usual. You had widespread riots and violence in American cities this past summer, involving almost 80 cities. You may have them this winter; we hope and pray we will not. Now is the time to provide against that situation.

So I urge that this matter be dealt with on the national priority to which it is entitled. Do not charge the Vietnam war against this priority. If you do, you will suffer a tremendous slackening in morale, as well as grave danger to domestic tranquility, which we have already experienced.

Finally, Mr. President, everything the Senator from West Virginia has said we have done. These are meaningful jobs, based on training, based on education. They tie the private enterprise system in completely.

This program is basic, constructive, and well architected. This is the very contribution. This was Senator CLARK's program. I wrote into it all the features the Senator from West Virginia has stated he wants. They are in the bill.

The important feature is that this matter must be put on the right priority. We are not paying for the Vietnam war. We should not be under the charge by millions of Americans that we are taking it out of their backs. That is why this program is necessary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alaska.

THE EFFORTS TO FIGHT THE WAR ON POVERTY SHOULD BE EXPANDED—NOT CUT BACK

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have been consistently voting against all amendments intended to cut back the funds to be made available for the war on poverty.

This is no time to go back on the Nation's commitments to our economically disadvantaged.

For years now I have been stating that the United States is engaged in an illegal, immoral, and unconstitutional war in Vietnam, where it is an aggressor against people who have been fighting for their independence from foreign domination for decades.

It is bad enough for the United States to become involved in fighting such an unjustified war in Vietnam at the cost of tens of thousands of fine American boys killed or wounded at an ever-escalating rate and at a cost in dollars of more than \$3 billion each month.

It is far, far worse to say that the United States is so deeply committed to fighting in Vietnam that it must neglect its vital needs at home. What shall it profit the United States to continue the costly stalemate in Vietnam while our cities continue in their squalor or go up in flames, while its poor face at least another generation of misery and despair, while its natural resources lie fallow and undeveloped, and while the education and health needs of its people are being shortchanged?

Some years ago, Nikita Khrushchev, speaking for the Soviet Union about the United States, said: "We shall bury you!"

Are we now seeing this prophecy coming true?

While the vital resources of the United States in both men and dollars are being needlessly squandered in the rice paddies and jungles of Vietnam, the Soviet Union is able to devote its men and money to the development of its own country.

This reckless and needless course of action is cruelly unfair to those men and women of the United States who were promised the alleviation of their manifold ills through an all-out war against poverty only to have the wherewithal to carry out the war wasted in Vietnam.

I cannot, I will not, vote to deprive the poor of the United States of funds so urgently needed for their relief only to have those funds siphoned off not only for irresponsibly fighting a senseless war in Vietnam but also to line the pockets of the corrupt military and civilian officials of the Government of South Vietnam.

I shall vote against recommitting this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr.

President, I shall support the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to strike title II from the bill.

If title II is retained it would cost \$2.8 billion over the amount recommended in the budget. We are already confronted with a deficit averaging \$2 billion a month and an administration request for a 10 percent increase in taxes. It should be pointed out that each 1 percent increase in taxes provides approximately \$1 billion. So those who will vote to retain title II in the bill, which would require an additional \$2.8 billion expenditure should be reconciled to the fact that they will in effect be voting for a 3 percent increase across-the-board in income taxes. This is above the increase already requested by the President. Unless they are willing to finance that increase I do not believe they should vote for the expenditures.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In summation, I call to the attention of Senators, first, that no hearings have been held on title II.

Second, the language in title II is vague, ambiguous, unclear, and the programs provided for are not concrete and well delineated.

Third, ample authorities exist now to do the things which title II would provide.

Fourth, we would be embarking on a new program which we might expect, as I said yesterday, to mushroom, like the prophet's gourd, overnight. Title II would provide authorization for \$2.8 billion over the next 2 years; and at the end of that time, of course, we might expect—if we have learned anything by experience—that the next request would be even larger.

Fifth, I call attention again to the fact that this authorization is above the President's request, in the amount of \$2.8 billion. That represents almost \$3 per minute for every minute that has passed since Jesus Christ was born.

So I say to my colleagues that here is the place to apply some economy to a measure which has not been requested by the President, and to a measure which will only exacerbate the problems concomitant with a great national deficit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I will answer the Senator from West Virginia in a friendly way, but categorically.

First, there was no need for hearings on this emergency employment bill. We have a pamphlet this thick showing what all the witnesses said and the statements we received, emphasizing the need for an emergency employment program now. Hearings would not have changed this amount of \$1 nor would it have changed one word in the bill.

Second, the language is not vague. It is precise. It would give the Secretary of Labor exactly what he would need to put this action into effect. The bill is well drawn. It is not vague.

Third, there is not ample authority to put this program into effect, and I am surprised that the Senator from West Virginia should say there is. Although there may be authority, there is no money; and what is needed is the money to do the job.

Fourth, the Senator from West Virginia has said that the new program will mushroom—and it probably will. It probably will mushroom next year, because the Urban Coalition has asked for a million jobs, not 200,000; and I predict that before 1968 is over, we will get them, because we need them, and the American people will insist on it.

Fifth, of course, this bill is above the budget request of the President. This is so because the President's budget request authorizes a swollen military budget, far above the legitimate security needs of the United States.

This is not the place to apply economy. As I have said earlier in this debate, the place from which to get the money is the military budget.

I have said that I would vote in opposition to the motion but I release all my colleagues who are committed to vote in support of the Emergency Employment Act to vote as they see fit. They will vote as their consciences dictate, and my conscience dictates that I vote against the motion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am going to vote for the emergency program of on-the-job training for unemployed people provided in title II of the Economic Opportunity Act amendments bill we are now considering. I think it is better to train people to be workers and taxpayers than to leave them on the welfare rolls. This whole program will cost less for an entire year than the Vietnam war costs every 2 weeks. It will provide some Federal funds to continue the emergency employment efforts Governor Agnew of Maryland started in Baltimore this summer. These jobs and the money to pay for them are desperately needed in our own State.

This is no WPA bill. It will provide a steppingstone between unemployment and jobs in private business for tens of thousands of untrained people every year. Cities and States will receive the money necessary to hire unemployed people to work on public projects—like park construction, conservation, and housing and neighborhood improvement—which are needed in both cities and rural areas. The program will take more than 200,000 untrained workers a year, give them on-the-job training, and move these men into private employment as rapidly as possible, in order to make taxpayers out of tax eaters.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, today I voted against the motion of the acting majority leader, Senator BYRD, of West Virginia, to recommit S. 2338 with instructions to the committee to strike from the bill title II. Title II would have provided an authorization of \$2.8 billion for jobs for the unemployed. The motion was successful, and title II has been stricken from the bill.

The support of title II was a matter of great controversy. In frankness, if it had been adopted and passed and approved by the House, it would create a difficult fiscal problem. Thus, the question of voting against striking this title did raise the question of fiscal responsibility, even though it was known that it would be stricken from the bill.

But as in all our decisions in the Senate regarding appropriations, Members

give priority to those subjects which they believe to be of the greatest importance. During this session, I have voted to reduce appropriations in a total sum larger than that involved in title II of this bill. On September 25, I voted against the military construction bill authorizing \$2.3 billion which could have been postponed to later years. Bills which will be presented to the Senate before this session is over will cost more than \$2.8 billion—for programs which are not needed in this year, and against which I will vote. I voted for title II as an expression of my belief that a program to provide employment must eventually be adopted by the Congress. While there are undoubtedly those who could find employment, and every effort must be made in this direction, there are thousands who because of lack of education and training cannot do so. This problem of unemployment, lack of education and housing have become the major domestic issues before this country, and must be met. They will require the full efforts of the Federal Government and also local governments and most important our private enterprise system.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it has frequently been said that the U.S. Senate is the greatest deliberative body in the world. In fact, it has been accused at times of being too deliberative. Be that as it may, I respectfully suggest today that this great deliberative body consider an admittedly extreme but definitely possible alternative, that is, action without deliberation. Is there even one among us who would advocate such procedure? Who in these ranks would substitute impulse for committee hearings, whim for deliberations, and reflexes for Senate debate? The very idea, Mr. President, sounds preposterous. But that is precisely what we are being asked to do today. Despite the deepest traditions of the Senate, despite this body's historic insistence on thorough investigation and full discussion, we have been offered for action the unstudied, undocumented, untested and unproven Emergency Employment Act. No hearings were held on this bill, Mr. President. Not 1 minute of subcommittee consideration was given to it. Instead, the Emergency Employment Act was simply tacked onto the Economic Opportunity Amendments and sent to the full committee with scarcely more than what amounted to a sparse letter of introduction. You might say, Mr. President, that the full committee gave this intruder the attention it deserved under the circumstances for it failed completely to give the act the detailed consideration due any proposal of this magnitude. In fact, the report expressing the need for such a program is no more than a compilation of excerpts from testimony on S. 1545 as well as some articles expressing the need for the creation of jobs. Where is the expert testimony? Where is the examination of witnesses? Where are the normal, probing, clarifying, perfecting committee arguments, pro and con? There are none, Mr. President, and for this and other reasons which I shall mention in a moment, I believe that this bill should be recommitted.

If, Mr. President, there had been full hearings and study of the proposed

Emergency Employment Act, two highly important facts would certainly have been emphasized and publicized. First, of course, is the fact that enactment of this legislation would cost the taxpayers \$2.8 billion, or nearly one-third of the amount which will be collected if the President's request for a tax increase is approved by the Congress. Second, and most important, is the fact that the act fails to provide even a plan which might result in meaningful and permanent employment opportunities for the disadvantaged. I shall discuss each of these points briefly.

At the present time, as we all know, the Congress is being asked by the President to approve a 10 percent surtax. Passage of this legislation will only remove some \$8 billion from a budgetary deficit which, it is estimated, could reach \$29 billion for the fiscal year. Yet the Emergency Employment Act would eat up nearly one-third of the extra revenue collected. The American taxpayer is already shouldering a heavy burden, and your mail and my mail show that he is beginning to rebel. If he is to be asked to carry this additional load as well, he deserves to know that the money is not going to be channeled into a wasteful effort. Yet we have no evidence to this effect. What kinds of jobs will be provided? How many? Is this the best plan for alleviating the existing employment problem? Our taxpayers, Mr. President, and this body which represents them have a right and a duty to demand answers to these questions.

Frankly, Mr. President, without testimony to the contrary, this seems to be simply another case of leaving everything to the Secretary although in the very bill we are considering today we have had ample evidence of the results of such procedure.

In the absence of full hearings and studies, we must try to interpret the Emergency Employment Act from its text alone and herein we find that the intent is to provide employment for "large concentrations of persons who are unable to obtain jobs in regular, competitive employment because of lack of education, occupation and skill, or work experience and because of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement." In order to accomplish this, it directs the Secretary of Labor to authorize funds for employment programs in such fields as health, public safety, education, recreation, streets, and parks. However, these will not be permanent employment opportunities. They will only be make work. I submit, Mr. President, that the circumstances of today dictate against the application of such methods which, as we all know, were once employed in another era to meet a different problem. Let me explain. When the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps were instituted during the great depression, the unemployment rate in this Nation was 24.9 percent. Those were devastating times demanding drastic measures. Of necessity, the viable solution sought at the time required the inclusion of make-work programs as there was a desperate need to regenerate the economy; that is,

to put money into people's pockets and thereby increase purchasing power. Today, on the other hand, our Nation is generally affluent, shouldering an unemployment rate of less than 4 percent. Consequently, there is no need for us to tread down the path we took in the 1930's under dissimilar conditions.

Make no mistake, Mr. President, I do not speak lightly of our unemployment problem. Even an unemployment rate of 4 percent demands our attention and assistance, and the degree of urgency becomes all the more apparent when we study the problem in its true perspective and perceive the extent to which the illness is concentrated in our heavily populated urban areas. For instance, 15 percent of the people living in Hough are without work; 12 percent in South Los Angeles; 13 percent in the Bayside section of Oakland, and 11 percent in the Mission-Fillmore district of San Francisco. Appropriately, the bill recognizes the need in such areas but it fails to provide the proper remedy. True, the unemployed in Hough and South Los Angeles and in hundreds of other similar areas throughout the country need jobs, but jobs, as such, are not enough. They need lasting jobs with advancement possibilities. Today it is estimated that there are 1.3 million job vacancies in industry. The task we now face, therefore, is to provide the unemployed person with the necessary skills so that he can fill these existing vacancies. This is the basic philosophy behind economic opportunity and we should not distort it. What we need—indeed, what is envisioned by the phrase "economic opportunity"—is emphasis on our school systems, our adult basic education programs, vocational education, transportation and job skill training. Short-term, make-work jobs will not suffice.

The Congress has considered and made available many job training programs. It is now taking under advisement other plans designed to accomplish the same end—for example, the provision for tax incentives for industry to offer training programs to the unemployed or upgrading programs to the presently employed, and the proposal that tax incentives be offered to industries which create new plants in disadvantaged urban areas, thereby bringing job opportunities within geographical reach of the unemployed. Before the enactment of any of these proposals, however, hearings will be conducted and sufficient testimony will be taken so that the Congress can make intelligent decisions in terms of need, cost-effectiveness and possible efficacy as compared to other programs. On the Emergency Employment Act, we have no such information.

I might add in conclusion, Mr. President, that private industry has already demonstrated dramatically that it can and will tackle the job and produce positive results. In my own area of Los Angeles, for instance, in the highly publicized community of Watts, private enterprise under the leadership of Chad McClellan went to work voluntarily with no Government funding whatsoever and filled at least 18,000 jobs in a year and a half. Also in Watts, Aerojet-General

opened a manufacturing plant to employ local people in making tents for the armed forces. The company's first Government contract was worth \$2.5 million and resulted in the employment of 450 persons. Mr. President, these are permanent job opportunities that are being offered. I would hope that when the Congress embarks on an emergency employment program it will confine itself to finding ways to offer this type of opportunity instead of some make-work plan which, I want to emphasize again, would provide only a temporary solution at best.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to recommit. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. PROUTY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MUSKIE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. DODD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were to vote I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY],

the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL, I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has been previously announced.

The pair of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 276 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Aiken	Fannin	McIntyre
Allott	Fong	Miller
Anderson	Fulbright	Monroney
Bennett	Griffin	Montoya
Bible	Hansen	Mundt
Boggs	Hayden	Murphy
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Burdick	Hill	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Smathers
Byrd, W. Va.	Hollings	Smith
Cannon	Hruska	Sparkman
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cotton	Kuchel	Symington
Curtis	Lausche	Talmadge
Dominick	Long, La.	Thurmond
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McGovern	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—28

Bartlett	Jackson	Percy
Bayh	Javits	Randolph
Case	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Clark	McCarthy	Scott
Cooper	McGee	Tydings
Gruening	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Mondale	Yarborough
Hart	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Nelson	
Hatfield	Pell	

NOT VOTING—18

Baker	Inouye	Moss
Brooke	Kennedy, Mass.	Muskie
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Pastore
Dodd	Magnuson	Prouty
Ervin	Mansfield	Russell
Gore	Morton	Tower

So the motion of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to recommit was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK, I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania whether he knows how many amendments are still to be offered. I believe there are about a dozen on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CLARK, Will the Senator from Illinois kindly withhold that request for 30 seconds?

Mr. President, in accordance with instructions just given by the Senate, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and

Public Welfare, I report back the bill, S. 2388—that is to say, the bill as reported to the Senate—with title II stricken out.

May I say to my good friend from Illinois that, so far as I know, all the remaining amendments are on his side of the aisle. I know that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has one, that the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] has two—

Mr. DIRKSEN, The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has one.

Mr. CLARK, I am not in the confidence of the Senator from Delaware. I am interested to know that he has one. I do not know what it is all about.

Does anyone else have amendments on this side of the aisle? I believe that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that perhaps a time limitation might be contrived on these amendments now that the authors of the bill are in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK, I regret to advise my good friend from Illinois that I am going to have to answer that on an ad hoc basis.

There are some amendments on which I would be glad to agree to a time limit, but there are others on which I have commitments, to Senators who are out of town, not to allow votes. I think I should, if I can, protect them until they get back from a very important engagement in Boston.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK, I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, I have one amendment the purpose of which is to change the figure in title II of the budget estimate.

Mr. CLARK, Title II has been disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, I meant title I.

Mr. CLARK, That is the very amendment on which I cannot agree to put a time limitation for the reasons I have just suggested. I will say to the Senator from Delaware there are a number of amendments we can dispose of in the meantime.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, If the Senator prefers, I will withhold that amendment. Let us dispose of the others first, and then I will offer it later.

Mr. CLARK, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Delaware.

Now, Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK, Is the bill open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER, The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROUTY, Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. PROUTY is as follows:

On page 91, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(h) Title VI of such Act is amended by adding the following new section after section 618:

"RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAMS

"SEC 619. Pursuant to section 602(d), the Director shall delegate his functions under section 221(b)(2) to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such functions shall be carried out through the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

On page 55, line 22, insert the following at the end of the sentence: "Funds for such program shall be transferred directly from the Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Financial assistance for such projects shall be provided by the Secretary on the basis of agreements reached with the Director directly to local educational agencies except as otherwise provided by such agreements."

On page 54, line 22, strike the word "subsection" and insert the following: "subsections (b) (2) and".

Mr. HARTKE, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY, I yield.

Mr. HARTKE, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY, Mr. President, last July the Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity jointly announced the establishment of a new educational venture—Operation Follow-through. Thirty school districts in 25 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico were selected to participate in pilot projects. "Graduates" of Headstart and other preschool programs—some 3,000 in all—are now enrolled in the projects.

Research shows that many of the gains made in Headstart are lost if these children do not continue to receive special attention and assistance in overcoming the handicaps imposed on them by poverty. Followthrough will provide that attention and assistance.

The central concept of Followthrough is to bring together the resources of school, community, and family to help the child. With the special assistance available under the program, it will be possible to provide individual educational diagnosis and prescription to meet the needs of the particular child. The programs utilize instructional specialists and new teaching techniques, teacher aides, psychologists, social workers, doctors, dentists—all services needed to bring the children up to the level of their more affluent classmates.

The amendment now before this body will insure that this program will continue to be administered in the manner currently provided in memorandum of understanding between the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Pursuant to this agreement, the Director has delegated his responsibility for administering this program to the Secretary—who, in turn, has vested the authority in the Office of Education.

This agreement provides in most cases that grants shall be made to local public educational agencies, which are required

to make services available on an equitable basis to children in both public and nonpublic schools. If a local educational agency is unable or unwilling to provide services to children in nonpublic schools on an equitable basis, the Commissioner of Education may arrange with an appropriate community action agency to provide such services. Where the school district serves an area which has a community action agency, it is required to consult with such agency in the development of its Followthrough program, and school districts must involve parents both in the development of the applications and in the carrying out of the programs. Under the memorandum of understanding, applicants are required to maintain current levels of effort in the grade levels in which the Followthrough children are enrolled. They are also encouraged to utilize other available funds, such as those provided under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in developing the best possible program for the early elementary grades.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, officials of OEO and the Office of Education stressed that the programs envisioned by the memorandum of understanding were the best, educationally, that could be devised. Funding through local educational agencies assures that Followthrough programs will be conducted during the school day, as well as after school and in the summer months. It avoids the danger that disadvantaged children in the early grades may be channeled into a second, competitive school system. It guarantees that those who know children best—their teachers and their parents—will devise supplementary programs designed to compensate for the crippling effects of poverty.

This program has already been launched. Children are now receiving these enriching services. To change the concept of Followthrough, as the Committee bill proposes to do, might mean the death of the program for the school year which has already begun. School systems have begun planning programs for next year. If the responsibility were taken away from the schools and given to community action agencies, the benefits of advance planning would be lost. The children would be the ultimate losers.

Even if community action agencies re-delegated authority for Followthrough to the school systems, administrative complexity would threaten the success of the program. Community action boards could exercise a veto power over educational decisions. School officials would be confronted with a maze of forms, guidelines, and regulations put out by several different Federal and State agencies. The result could be administrative chaos.

The amendment I propose will simplify the administrative mechanism for Operation Followthrough. It assures that this program, which is primarily a compensatory education program, will be carried out by our educational system. It assures that all the work which has gone into making the program a success will not be lost. I urge the Senate to adopt my amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from Vermont with respect to Followthrough merely writes into law the present administrative practice by which the program has been delegated to the Office of Education.

Mr. PROUTY. That is exactly what it proposes to do.

Mr. CLARK. As I said earlier when the Senator offered the amendment, I am perfectly willing and prepared to accept it. It is a good amendment. I cannot understand why any Senator would want to have a rollcall on it, because I do not know of any Senator who is against it. Therefore, I suggest we vote on the amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I asked for a rollcall vote on the amendment. I asked for a rollcall vote on it previously, and put it off when the amendment was withdrawn. The reason for it is that there is an inconsistency in approach. I have no quarrel with inconsistency, but I think the Senate should go on record as to whether these matters of education belong in an education bill or do not. It cannot divide people at the age of 3 and 4 and say we will put 3- and 4-year-olds under Operation Headstart in the Office of Economic Opportunity and then, when they cross the threshold of the grand old age of 5, say it thinks they should be under the Office of Education. I think they belong in the Office of Education. I think this is a good amendment.

The Headstart program is not a new program or an innovation. I remember when my sister, who was killed in an automobile accident in 1964, had a headstart operation in Dearborn, Mich., in 1951. So this is nothing new.

The problems of education belong in the schools. That is where they should be handled. Those people should be given the opportunity to handle education matters. That is where the Followthrough program belongs. It is an extension of Operation Headstart. If Headstart and Followthrough mean anything, they are part of the same program and they belong in the same agency.

The Senate went on record in a rollcall vote as favoring taking the operation Headstart and putting it in one agency of the Government. Now it is going to take another program, called Followthrough, which involves only possibly a difference of half a year in the age of these children, and say it should be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That is perfectly all right with me, but I think the Senate ought to display consistency.

I personally intend to vote for the amendment, as I did for the amendment which would have placed Headstart in the Office of Education. I am not going to detain the Senate, but I am glad we are going to have a rollcall vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 277 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Aiken	Hansen	Monroney
Allott	Harris	Montoya
Anderson	Hart	Morse
Bartlett	Hartke	Mundt
Bayh	Hatfield	Murphy
Bennett	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Boggs	Hill	Pearson
Brewster	Holland	Pell
Burdick	Hollings	Percy
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Proxmire
Cannon	Jackson	Randolph
Carlson	Javits	Ribicoff
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Smathers
Clark	Kuchel	Smith
Cooper	Lausche	Sparkman
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Spong
Curtis	Long, La.	Stennis
Dirksen	Magnuson	Symington
Dodd	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dominick	McCarthy	Thurmond
Eastland	McClellan	Tydings
Ellender	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Fong	McIntyre	Yarborough
Fulbright	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Griffin	Miller	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Mondale	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

Baker	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Brooke	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell
Ervin	Morton	Tower
Gore	Moss	

So Mr. PROUTY's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 67, line 1, strike "part B of title I and title II", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "part B of title I, title II, and part B of title III".

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand it, the pending amendment is the Governor's veto amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from California be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement for, let us say, a half an hour on a side on the pending amendment?

Mr. MURPHY. I would.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is the majority leader agreeable to that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment be limited to 1 hour, half of the time to be controlled by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the other half to be controlled by the manager of the bill, and that any amendments thereto must be germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Certain Senators want to vote on this amendment, and they will not be back until late afternoon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Senators will be coming and going all the time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania renews his unanimous-consent request. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from California yield himself?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Governor of a State in which a Job Corps camp is proposed to be established has the power, under section 109, to prohibit its construction and operation if he believes the burdens created by its operation would outweigh the benefits it might engender.

By the same token, section 209(c) grants the Governor a limited veto power over the title I, part B, and title II projects—the work training and community action programs.

Mr. President, may we have order? I am extremely sorry to ask for order, but it is difficult for me to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MURPHY. It is very difficult for me to be heard. I ask for special thought-

fulness on the part of my colleagues because I think what I have to say is quite important. Otherwise, I would not take up the time of the Senate to bring the matter to its attention.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 10 seconds?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join in the request of the Senator from California. The Senate owes him the courtesy, in view of the difficulty he has in being heard, of remaining in complete silence while we listen to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator from Oregon very much.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Governor of a State in which a Job Corps Camp is proposed to be established, has the power, under section 109, to prohibit its construction and operation if he believes the burdens created by its operation would outweigh the benefits it might engender.

By the same token, section 209(c) grants the governor a limited veto power over title I, part B, and title II projects—the work training and community action programs.

The amendment I am sending to the desk would confer this same limited veto power on the Governor for title III, B programs; so that the State's chief executive could prohibit the implementation of a migrant assistance program within 30 days upon receiving a copy of the grant if he did not believe it would result in an effective weapon for battling the symptoms and causes of poverty among migrant workers.

Since 1964, when the Congress inaugurated the war on poverty, the State OEO offices have gained a great deal of technical expertise in the problems causing and perpetuating poverty.

They have also become equipped to deal with the particular problems of their States, and we all know that these problems vary from State to State. While the regional OEO offices concentrate on the poverty program over a three-, four-, or five-State area, we know that the State OEO offices are well acquainted with the entire needs of one specific State. Consequently, it seems to me that the regional and Federal OEO offices ought to look to the State office for the specific requirements, needs and programs that should be generated for that particular State.

The necessity of utilizing this knowledge and advice is underscored in a letter I received from Mr. Ralph Gunderson, chief of migrant programs of the California State OEO, and in a telegram from Governor Reagan. The correspondence ably states the problem which exists in my home State due to the overlapping and uncoordinated activities of the State and regional offices. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the telegram be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and the telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER FROM MR. GUNDERSON

In answer to your query on migrant adult education programs in California:

(1) On January 1, 1967, the administra-

tion's position toward migrant programs was made known to U.S. OEO. The first priority was housing for migrants with associated programs of day care and health. Advice to the Governor came from Dr. Paul O'Rourke, former Director of California's OEO, who re-emphasized priorities in testimony in Stockton on May 11, 1967, before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Farm Labor. This position has not been changed and has the concurrence of the Honorable Theron J. Bell, Director of California OEO.

(2) The California migrant master plan is designed to provide adult education for migrants on a continuing basis in conjunction with other programs, in an integrated frontal assault on migrant poverty. Funding outside the migrant master plan prevents a coordinated and structured effort to eliminate the causes of this poverty, and proliferates programs which contemplate no logical culmination (i.e., jobs).

(3) There is a wide body of criticism at local levels about staffing for these projects not under state auspices. Well known long time proponents of dissent and agitation of means of approaching farm labor problems are all too frequently found on these staff rolls. In our opinion, their very presence mitigates against community acceptance and cooperation which is essential to success in this type of program.

(4) In at least two counties (Kern and Stanislaus) migrant adult education projects were approved without full discussion of the issues. Two members of the Board of Supervisors of Kern County resigned from the Community Action Council because they could not obtain full details on the programs. Although some members of the Stanislaus County CAC insisted on further debate, the project was approved without such discussion.

(5) The stipend system is a source of potential conflict with gainful employment on farms where the school may be competing with the farmer for the time of the worker.

(6) Adult education programs operated in camps under the migrant master plan tend to serve migrants exclusively with the intent of breaking the cycle of poverty. Local grants of this kind operating presumably only in the off-season tend to serve seasonal farm workers and do little to solve migrant problems.

(7) Ineffective administration is a common charge leveled at these programs; i.e., proposed salary raises for personnel before a project is even begun, early staffing, excessive needs etc. We do not think any of the projects are yet mature enough to evaluate their administration.

(8) Educational programs of this sort are now under consideration in spite of the omni-present controversy.

(9) The programs tend to be extremely dear, particularly in terms of administration changes already at state OEO.

None of these things appear to comply with the spirit of the President's message of November 11, 1966, titled, "Advice and Consultations with State and Local Officials."

RALPH GUNDERSON,

Chief, Migrant Programs, OEO.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1967.

Senator MURPHY: I request that you implement changes in legislation to provide Governors veto power over Title III(B) migrant projects. These are intended to alleviate poverty among farm workers and their families, problems which intimately and profoundly affect this State's economy. This power is necessary to prevent wasteful programs and to provide a coordinated Federal-State assault on existing problems.

RONALD REAGAN.

Mr. MURPHY. The fact that the Governor is unable to veto title IIIB programs leaves the door wide open for the

OEO to move any title II program, which the Governor has seen fit to refuse, into title III. To demonstrate this, let me cite one example from California.

The center for community development, known as CCCD, was originally funded in the amount of \$280,000 through title II. This organization co-sponsored the Watts Social Action Training Center—SATC—which gave 16- to 24-year-old "leaders," mostly from outside Watts, an "intensive social action orientation program" which included the teaching of how to participate in an organized picket line and demonstrations. The CCCD also organized farmworkers through its main headquarters in Del Rey, Calif., by lending personnel to Mr. Caesar Chavez, who was active in the area at that time. It also helped garbage collectors in Bakersfield form a union and organize a strike. Finally, it formed the Los Angeles Welfare Rights Organizing Committee.

Not only did I question the propriety of these actions, but Governor Reagan did also; and when the CCCD requested a \$109,000 refunding grant, the Governor vetoed it. This he did by utilizing section 209(c).

Soon thereafter, however, an organization called the Central California Action Associates—it will be noticed that they have substituted an "A" for one "C" and an "A" for one "D"—requested more than \$3 million for an adult migrant education program to cover an eight county area and to be funded under title IIIB. Not only was it disturbing to note that the application submitted by the CCAA for such funding contained little description of the consistency of the adult migrant education program it was to encompass, but also that the directors of the CCAA were exactly the same—to the man—as the board of directors of the CCCD, which no longer functioned. This was obviously an action to circumvent the veto of the Governor. The Governor, of course, had no say in approving or refusing this new grant, since it was a title IIIB program.

Today, it is funded in the amount of \$1.5 million and it is beginning to operate. Exactly what the program is doing, I have not found out. I am hopeful that it will work effectively in alleviating the needs of the migrant workers and help the poor whom it was intended to help in the first instance. But I have no evidence of this. The directors of the program have since been changed—I am pleased to report—but that is not the point. The accomplishment of such a change took months of concerted effort on the part of the citizens in the eight-county area who were to be affected by this program, and on the part of the Governor's office, this Senator, and other Members of Congress. So that the Members of Congress, the Governor, this Senator, and the citizens of the area are in complete agreement with respect to this matter.

In the meantime, the poor migrant workers, who are supposed to be the ones we are trying to help, were just being told what might be done in the future for their benefit; but, actually, they were getting little, if any, benefit. This could have been averted had the Governor

been able originally to review the program. The veto assures the State will have an opportunity to be heard, to improve the program. The veto is only used when necessary and Mr. Sargent Shriver can override the veto, as he could under the other sections. But at least the local representatives of the people of that area should have been given an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. President, this is one of many examples that I could cite which clearly are not the intent of the program, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I believe, quite honestly, that in the administration of these large sums of money, much improvement could and should be made immediately.

One improvement I strongly recommend is close cooperation between the Federal OEO and the Governors of the several States. The recommendations of the State OEO to the Governor must be concurred in by the Federal OEO, because, as I pointed out in my opening remarks, they are the people in a position to know the actual and practical needs and they should be the people with firsthand knowledge and information and experience to know how best to take care of the needs of the migrants.

Therefore, Mr. President, I strongly recommend that the limited veto which is granted to the Governors for title IB and title II programs be extended to cover projects under title IIIB.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, first, I should like to thank the Senator from California for the courtesy extended to all Senators by distributing the explanation of his amendment. I believe he did so last week. So there is no surprise involved with respect to the proposed amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I say that I was prepared to offer the amendment last week, on one very dull afternoon; but at the request of another Senator who wished to be present and to make remarks concerning the amendment, I withheld offering it until the manager of the bill signified that he desired that I bring it forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We are now engaged in debate with respect to the amendment. I oppose the amendment, but I do appreciate the courtesy of having the Senator's speech in advance, so that I had several days to review it.

This is rather an inappropriate time to be talking about migrant workers, when we have the St. Louis Cardinals in Boston. Some of the fellows from Puerto Rico play for Boston, and the score is one to one at this time, I am informed.

Mr. MURPHY. May I say that presently, in my State of California, because of some misunderstandings, which I will deal with in another amendment I shall offer later, we are now short farm labor, so that 20 percent of the crop of tomatoes in the Salinas Valley has already gone to rot in the field. The Governor of the

State has had to accept the suggestion which I believe was made originally by former Governor Brown, 2 years ago, to release 400 prisoners to work in the grape vineyards in order to keep the grape crop from rotting on the vine.

I am in great sympathy with what is going on in Boston, and I may say that I have a personal interest, having been a classmate of Tom Yawkey and having been on the Boston season ticket list for many years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This is on my time, but it is pleasant to hear, anyway.

Mr. MURPHY. I am most appreciative of the conditions in Boston, but the conditions in California insist that I bring this matter forward at this time. In other words, I would have been glad to wait another few days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say, in connection with pressing prisoners into work for the harvest in California, there are a large number of unemployed people in Texas, particularly now, because of the tragic floods there.

It has been my effort over the years to try to develop communication lines, transportation, and adequate housing that would bring farmworkers who want to work from areas, such as Texas, to California.

Mr. MURPHY. Nobody has been more diligent about this problem than the Senator from New Jersey. I hope that some day we will be able to accomplish all of these things, such as transportation and communication and make a practical approach in getting the workers who want the job to the job so that they may take advantage of the situation and that the economy will not be interrupted by not having workers in the right place at the right time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator. I appreciate his conscientious efforts in helping migratory farmworkers. We saw some of the worst of the housing in California. I believe I am correct in what I am about to say. I recall the junior Senator from California, at his own expense, made several trips to California to straighten out that matter.

Mr. MURPHY. It is done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, returning to the amendment extending the veto power of Governors to title III programs, I am opposed to the measure for many reasons.

Most of the programs that are developed under this title come from private agencies and not State or local government. The list shows the American Friends Service Committee, the bishop's committee for the Spanish speaking, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the migratory committee of the National Council of Churches, and the National Consumers League have programs or support groups having such programs. The Americans Friends also have a self-help housing program.

The amendment proposes that the Governor could veto these privately generated programs that reach down into the real bowels of poverty, the poorest people in this country; and yet the State and its Governor are not charged with any financial responsibility at all in this

program. They have no financial responsibility at stake. They do have a competitive stake because the funds for the total of these programs are limited.

The American Friends or the Catholic Rural Life Conference could submit applications and the State might have an application. They would therefore be in competition for funds. It seems to me that if I were a Governor, I would fight for my State program, and if the funds were limited, I would veto the private program so that the State program could go further. This is only human.

I know there is a limited veto in other programs. I was here at this desk about 5 years ago when I accepted the first Governors' veto amendment. That proposal was offered by the then-Democratic Senator from South Carolina, now a Republican from South Carolina, [Mr. THURMOND]. I accepted it, frankly, not because I believed in it, but because I thought it was necessary to pass the National Service Corps volunteers. In fact, the judgment was right. We won by two votes.

Ever since then, the veto idea has been running through several programs. This is a most inappropriate program for it because most of the activities that are generated out of title III come from private generations. It has nothing to do with Governor Reagan and the State of California, or Governor Wallace and the State of Alabama, and yet they are the two Governors who have been most responsible for vetoes where vetoes are permitted. As a matter of fact these two States account for 60 percent of all the vetoes cast.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I answer the Senator by saying that I completely respect his judgment in this matter. In preparing this amendment I thought of all the possibilities that could occur to me. However, I notice that at the outset there was a Governor's veto in the poverty program. Then as it developed, after I came to the Senate, the veto was taken out of the poverty program. Then it was seen fit to restore a temporary veto, an almost veto. It is not a real veto. It merely gives the Governor the opportunity to object and object publicly within 30 days. The director of the program at all times can override the Governor; at all times he can say, as we may say here in our judgment—God help us if we are wrong—this program is good and this program is bad.

All I ask in this amendment is exactly the same potential for the local people, the State people, the people most intimately concerned with this matter, to have a chance to express their desire or object in the limited veto which is now in existence throughout the remainder of the program. I believe it was put there because public feelings were so high that it was better to restore it on a limited basis.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I would yield to the Senator, but this is now on my time. Will the Senator from California give me equal time if I use all of my time?

Mr. MURPHY. I shall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield to me for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the Senator 5 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I was the Governor of Wyoming for 4 years before coming to the Senate. During that time we had a number of proposals by the Office of Economic Opportunity for different kinds of programs within the State of Wyoming. I speak particularly of Job Corps programs.

It was not my interest or desire at that time to try to veto, by virtue of the power that was vested in me as the Governor of Wyoming, programs with which I might not have been in complete accord because I differed with the philosophy, but rather to see if what I did would be most helpful, so that the Federal dollar spent would result in the greatest amount of good, and because of my intimate knowledge of Wyoming—as would be true of any other Governor of a State—I was able to call the attention of the Office of Economic Opportunity to certain conditions I thought were important. Had it not been for my exercising the veto that was then vested in me I am certain that some Federal funds would have been wasted.

First, I felt in the establishment of a Job Corps camp in Wyoming, it was important that the camp had the support of a majority of the people in the city which was adjacent or contiguous to that Job Corps camp.

I polled the city of Casper, Wyo., by talking to the mayor, the city council, the county commissioners, and the school people to find out if they were receptive to the idea. After I found that they were I gave my endorsement to the idea.

At another time a camp was proposed in Jeffrey City, Wyo., and I said that a Job Corps camp should not be placed there.

My reasons were, despite the fact a number of people were there and there was a post office present in that little town, it was a town established by a mining corporation and there were no civil officials as would be found in the average city. Without any police protection or any kind of civil authority being exercised, I felt it would not be proper to establish a Job Corps camp in that area.

I suggest that no one knows better than the Governor of the State the specific conditions which may determine the effectiveness with which a program can be implemented, or some of the pitfalls likely to overtake it. For those reasons, I support the amendment of the Senator from California because, it seems to me, it makes good sense to bring to bear the most precise knowledge we can obtain in each of these areas as we attempt to implement Federal programs and spend Federal dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have been deluged with telegrams and letters in opposition to the amendment dealing with the Governor's

veto. Many of them come from the State of California, by the way.

Mr. MURPHY. If the Senator will forgive this interjection, I am very certain that he has received many from California. I venture to say that I can almost guess the names of some of those who sent them, and I can almost tell the Senator what they say.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. They are from some of the Senator's very best friends.

Mr. MURPHY. I know a great deal about this problem in California. I have been at it for 20 years now and I know exactly what they have in mind.

Let me assure the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that I would not be putting the Senate and the visitors in the gallery through the discomfiture, if I did not think this was extremely important.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will say that these letters and telegrams represent a broad geographical expression of opinion. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYNOD OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN AREA, THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.,

Los Angeles, Calif., September 28, 1967.

Subject: Amendment to title IIIB, migrant section, OEO Act.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: It is my understanding that an amendment to the OEO Act has been introduced by Senator Murphy with regard to Title IIIB, the Migrant Section. Evidently this amendment would give individual state governor's full veto power over OEO programs related to migrant workers within the boundaries of their states.

I am writing in opposition to such an amendment and urge that you do all that is possible to prevent its adoption.

The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. called upon its constituents in 1965 to "recognize poverty as a problem which evokes repentance and renewed Christian commitment by . . . continuing all necessary ministries of symptomatic relief while concentrating on the discovery and eradication of the causes of poverty; . . . insisting that the poor themselves be drawn into decision-making participation in the shaping of their destiny, which is none other than our common destiny . . ."

My information indicates that the OEO programs related to migrant workers are indeed trying to give symptomatic relief while researching root causes of poverty and that this is being done with full participation of the poor themselves. Accordingly, they have my support and encouragement although I recognize that any innovative programs will have some failures and create some antagonism.

My belief is that poverty is a national problem and that migrant poverty is, if not national, at least inter-state in scope. For this reason, I believe that full consideration should be given to the views of individual state governors but that they should not have absolute control over the life and death of basic remedial programs which have been deemed essential for the health of the nation by the collective wisdom of Congress.

I am contacting other persons within our denomination on this matter in the hope that they might personally become involved

in this issue which I consider vital to the rural poor, not only in California but in other states as well.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. HERMANSON,
Associate Executive Secretary.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N.J., September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have been informed recently that Senator Murphy of California is proposing an amendment to the OEO statute concerning migrant labor which would permit a veto or suspension of programs in a given state when the governor disagreed with it. Although I have not had the opportunity to read the amendment, if the description I have had is accurate, then I want to register strong disapproval.

During the last nine months I have become familiar with some of the problems of migrant labor as a result of being on Governor Hughes' Task Force on Migrant Farm Labor. I think the work done by OEO has a great potential to help migrant workers, and I should regret it greatly if some uncooperative governor in any state should decide to delay a project. For delay often means the demise of these projects, as we have all observed. I can see no good that the amendment would achieve, and I visualize much harm instead. A little more compassion for the plight of these people rather than building roadblocks against aid to them seems to be in order.

Sincerely yours,

W. DUANE LOCKARD,
Vice Chairman, Governor's Task Force
on Migrant Farm Labor (New Jersey).

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, JR.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This is no time to undercut the migrant division of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I therefore oppose most vigorously the amendment offered by Senator George Murphy giving governors veto power over migrant programs please oppose this amendment with your usual effectiveness.

ROBERT E. LUCEY,
Archbishop of San Antonio.

GOLDEN, COLO.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge defeat of Murphy amendment giving State Governors veto power over section 111(b) proposals for OEO programs. Workers are from many States across the Nation. I recommend administration nationally and regionally for more uniformity of OEO programs according to need. Cannot condone situation in some States where OEO programs would be politically segregated by decision of Governor.

Rev. JACK H. ALFORD,
National Council of Churches.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 30, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: We vigorously oppose the Murphy amendment which would give Governor the power of veto over OEO programs for migrant workers. We encourage you to do all within your power to oppose this measure.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. MCCARTHY,
Acting Director, Western Regional Office of Bishops Committee for the Spanish Speaking.

DENVER, COLO.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator Murphy's amendment to OEO bill should be defeated giving a Governor the power of veto over OEO programs is not in the best interest of the people needing the program. Please do what you can to defeat the amendment.

EDWARD L. WHITTEMORE,
Executive Secretary.

JAS. L. SELMSER,
Director, Migrant Ministry.

FRANKLIN P. WHERRY,
Chairman, Social Action Department,
Colorado Council of Churches.

BERKELEY HEIGHTS, N.J.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please be advised that the Consumer League of New Jersey stands in opposition to Senator Murphy's proposed amendment of title 3B of the Economic Opportunity Act.

JOHN M. STOCHAJ,
Consumers League of New Jersey.

VISALIA, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge opposition to OEO amendment to allow Governors veto of migrant programs. Programs need flexibility and freedom from political interference.

HERBERT FOSTER, Jr.,
Agriculture Labor Representative,
American Friends Service Committee.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: The Texas Bishops Committee for the Spanish speaking vigorously opposes the Murphy amendment giving veto power to Governor. Please oppose.

Rev. PATRICK FLORES,
State Chairman.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National Bishops Committee for the Spanish Speaking opposes the amendment offered by Senator George Murphy placing veto power over migratory programs of OEO. Please oppose.

Rev. JOHN MCCARTHY,
Executive Secretary.

FAIR LAWN, N.J.,
October 2, 1967.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge negative vote, Governors veto over title 3B, Economic Opportunity Act. Regards progressive States.

Mrs. LORA LISS,
Member, Governor's
Migrant Labor Task Force.

LANSING, MICH.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please oppose amendment to title 3B of Economic Opportunity Act which allows State Governors veto power over migrant poverty programs. Services for interstate

people are easily dismissed by local opinion as responsibility of someone else.

WILL BENALLACK,
Director,
Michigan Migrant Ministry.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose amendment requiring the Governors signature on title III-B OEO programs because it delays the program.

SARA GRACIA.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the amendment requiring Governors signatures on title III-B OEO program.

Mrs. INEZ L. VALDEZ.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to defeat the amendment which would require the signature of the Governor on title III-B Office of Economic Opportunity project in many States. This amendment would stop many of the more meaningful projects for migrant and seasonal farm workers.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM H. STOCKARD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 30, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Washington, D.C.:

Centro Social Obrero, vigorously oppose the Murphy amendment which will give veto power to any Governor concerning migrant worker programs.

CENTRO SOCIAL OBRERO
Mexican League of the Construction Workers of North America.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am against the amendment proposed by Senator Murphy to title III-B migrant education. With such an amendment it would only delete or delay funds and programs for migrants.

DENARD W. DAVIS,
Coordinator, Adult Education,
Merced County.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 30, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Mission Economic Opportunity Council vigorously opposes the Murphy amendment which would give veto power to Governors over migrant worker programs.

Respectfully,

RAYMOND R. ACOSTA,
Chairman, Mission Area Community
Action Board.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I have been associated with programs for migrant workers and I am opposed to the amendment which would require the Governor's signature to title IIIB OEO projects. This would cost undue delay in programs designed to help migrant farm workers. I feel that the Governor of California is not in

sympathy with meaningful programs for migrant farm workers.

MARIA RODRIGUEZ,
Director, Planada Migrant Programs.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR HARRISON WILLIAMS: I have worked in this program for 3 years. Migrants need this program very much. I oppose amendment requiring Government signature on title 3B OEO programs. I urge you to oppose defeat amendment will only cause delay of program.

DORA BUSTOS.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to defeat the amendment title 3B OEO program. This program is very much needed in spite of opposed opinions. If not, it would only cause delay of program.

JUANS RAMIREZ.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the amendment requiring Governors signature on title 3B OEO programs.

DELORES BENABIDEZ.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS.

I oppose the amendment 3B OEO program for delay.

JUANITA MARTINEZ.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Reagan veto prerogative over California OEO 3B programs disastrous. Farm workers urge opposition Murphy amendment.

RALPH KENNEDY,
President, Los Angeles Presbyterian
Interracial Council.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the placing of title 3B under Governor veto.

WILLIAM BLACK.

LANSING, MICH.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We vigorously oppose any amendment in title 3B which would give to governors veto

power over the OEO migrant program. Many governors, including Michigan, have demonstrated little concern for migrant workers and are likely to prevent much needed programs for these disadvantaged people.

MIDWEST OFFICE BISHOPS COMMITTEE
FOR SPANISH SPEAKING AND LANSING
DIOCESAN MIGRANT APOSTOLATE.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This program is in great need for the migrant and seasonal workers. I oppose and urge you to defeat the amendment requiring Governor's signature on title 3b OEO program. It will only cause delay of EOC program.

Mrs. VERA SALEIDO.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Washington, D.C.:

I oppose the amendment requiring governor's signature on title III-B O.E.O. programs.

SAMUEL VLADIMIRSKY,
Director-Teacher, Planada Migrant
Child-Care Center.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you defeat amendment title 3B OEO. Migrants seasonal workers need this program in spite of opposed opinions. If not this will cause program delay.

FLORA R. MARTINEZ.

COATESVILLE, PA.,
October 2, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Migrants often ineligible state benefits. Title III funds should not be under Governors' veto.

CHARLES S. HEARNE,
President, Chester County Migrant
Commission.

LANTANA, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge Senate reject Senator Murphy's amendment to OEO appropriation OB bill allowing Governor's Veto title 3B.

FLORIDA COUNCIL OF CHAPTERS, NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS.

MIAMI, FLA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge against placing 3B under Governor's veto.

AUGUST VANDENBOSCHE,
Coordinating Committee for Farm-
workers.

VISALIA, CALIF.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate support you have given self help housing programs. Feel it would be a mistake to provide for Governor's veto in the OEO bill to title III-B programs as recently proposed by Senator Murphy. This could impede the development and expansion of this and other worthwhile programs to migrant and seasonal farm workers.

ROBERT MARSHALL,
Executive Director.

HANFORD, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly oppose EOA rider sponsored by Senator George Murphy to provide Governors' veto power over Title III-B projects. Believe this power would prevent many good programs from proving themselves.

JERALD L. WEBSTER,
Executive Director, Kings County Com-
munity Action Organization.

KENNETH SQUARE, PA.,
September 28, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr.,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Object to placing title 3 OEO Act under Governors' veto.

ALAN HARDY,
RITA HARDY,
ALICE MOULTON,
HENRIETTA SHOLARS,
ALLEN CROMMER,
JAMES HORGAN.

MERCED, CALIF.,
September 29, 1967.

Hon. HARRISON WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do all you can to defeat the amendment which would require the signature of the Governor on title 3b Office of Economic Opportunity project. This amendment would stop many of the more meaningful projects for migrant and seasonal farm workers.

ROBERT W. JONES,
Central Labor Council AFL-CIO.

TRENTON, N.J.,
October 1, 1967.

Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to express strong opposition to amendment proposed to title 3B.

Dr. PAUL T. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some tables on Governors' vetoes which were prepared by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR'S VEToes

Grantee	Funds and OEO approval	Governor's action	OEO action (or further action by Governor)
REGION III			
Alabama (9):			
New York Grant No. 8443, National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc., New York, N.Y.	\$229,767 (jointly with Georgia), training-technical assistant, Dec. 21, 1966.	Vetoed Jan. 9, 1967, by Gov. George Wallace. Veto sustained Mar. 13, 1967, by Gov. Lurleen Wallace.	Pending decision (as of Mar. 29, 1967). Decision not to override per letter, May 8, 1967.
Grant No. 3037-A/O, Mobile Area Community Action Committee, Mobile, Ala.	\$43,519, program development, May 14, 1966.	Vetoed June 17, 1966.	Resubmitted Oct. 3, 1966. 30-day waiting period passed without signature or veto. Funded.
Grant No. 3453, Antipoverty Coordinating Committee, SCLC, Inc., Wilcox County, Ala.	\$123,282, summer Headstart.	Vetoed.	Sustained.
Grant No. CG-8798-A/O, Wilcox County, Ala.	\$180,152, emergency family loan.	Vetoed Aug. 7, 1967.	Pending.
Grant No. 3250, St. Clair Child Development Program, St. Clair County, Ala. (Ashville).	\$47,790, summer Headstart, May 26, 1966.	Vetoed June 30, 1966.	Overridden Aug. 12, 1966.
Same program vetoed this year.	\$57,000.	Vetoed June 1967.	Overridden July 1967.
Grant No. 657, Birmingham Area Committee for Development of Economic Opportunities, Inc., Birmingham, Ala.	\$66,349, program development, Apr. 13, 1965.	Vetoed May 7, 1965.	Sustained.
Grant No. 464, Elk River Development Council, Fayetteville, Tenn.	Program development for 9-county area but Limestone County only one in Alabama.	Vetoed Alabama portion Apr. 23, 1965.	Sustained. (There was no veto of Tennessee portion.)
Grant No. 706-A/10, Huntsville Madison County Community Action Committee, Huntsville, Ala., community organization and training.	\$48,565, approved Mar. 15, 1967, people-for-people program.	Vetoed Apr. 28, 1967.	Withdrawn.
Grant No. 8881-A, Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA), farmers' cooperative, Selma, Ala.	\$399,967, demonstration grant, May 11, 1967.	Vetoed June 8, 1967.	Overridden.
Florida (3):			
Grant No. 119, Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., Miami.	\$957,503, child development program, day care.	Vetoed.	Governor withdrew veto May 9, 1967.
Grant No. 3035, Economic Opportunity Council, Inc., Tampa.	\$203,882, Headstart, day care.	do.	Do.
Do.	\$1,133,383, full year, Headstart.	do.	Do.
Mississippi (1): Grant No. 3155-A/1, Southwest Mississippi Opportunity, Inc., Woodville.	\$713,300, Headstart, Oct. 7, 1966.	Vetoed Nov. 1, 1966.	Overridden Nov. 16, 1966.
South Carolina (1): Grant No. 316, Council of Southern Mountains, Berea, Ky.	\$252,119 to 9 States, sec. 206.	Declined South Carolina's participation Mar. 15, 1965.	Sustained. (Continues in other 8 States.)
REGION IV			
Indiana (1): Grant No. 343, Indiana Office of Economic Opportunity, Indianapolis.	\$72,000, refunding application for State technical assistance (sec. 209) (grant was never sent to Governor so this is actually not a veto).	Withdrawn February 1967 and STA closed by Governor.	Sustained by regional office.
REGION V			
Louisiana (2):			
Grant No. 5103 (St. Mary's Parish), Southern Consumer Education Foundation, Lafayette.	Full-year Headstart.	Vetoed June 6, 1966.	Governor rescinded his veto June 6, 1966.
Grant No. CG-5103-A-3 (St. Mary's Parish), Southern Consumer Education Foundation, Lafayette.	do.	Vetoed June 1967.	Pending (?).
REGION VI			
Missouri (1): Grant No. 8825, St. Louis Human Development Corp., St. Louis.	\$346,000, technical assistance (206), Feb. 17, 1967.	Vetoed Mar. 6, 1967.	Resubmitted Mar. 16, 1967, for training portion only. Governor approved by letter Mar. 24.
North Dakota (2):			
Grant No. 6315, Legal Aid Society of North Dakota, Bismarck.	\$292,385, legal services, Apr. 25, 1966.	Vetoed May 13, 1966.	Sustained.
Grant No. 776/2, Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians, Belcourt.	\$40,226, legal services.	Vetoed May 23, 1966.	Do.
Wyoming (1): Grant No. 6261, county of Natrona opportunity development, Casper.	\$24,816.	Vetoed Apr. 1, 1966.	Do.
California (8):			
Grant No. 8837-A/O, California Center for Community Development, Del Rey.	\$109,520, demonstration grant (207) funded.	Vetoed Mar. 30, 1967.	Partial override to reimburse grantee for operating expenses incurred during Governor's consideration.
Grant No. CG-6764-A/O, Yolo County Emergency Migrant Loan Program, Economic Opportunity Committee of Yolo County.	\$15,000, emergency loan funded, July 11, 1967.	Vetoed Aug. 11, 1967.	OEO action under consideration.
Grant No. CG-7167-A/O, Alameda County Legal Aid Society.	\$32,314, on-campus legal services funded July 20.	Vetoed Aug. 23, 1967.	Objections presently being reviewed with Governor's office.
Grant No. CG-0656-B/4, Community Action Council of San Joaquin County.	\$69,911, adult basic education.	do.	OEO action under consideration.
Grant No. CG-0629-B/6, Solano Economic Opportunity Commission.	\$92,992, legal services.	Vetoed July 6, 1967.	Veto verbally withdrawn by Governor's office; withdrawal not as yet confirmed.
Grant No. BWPM-7-7234-05, Ventura County Community Action Commission.	\$63,270, job placement (U.S. Department of Labor program).	do.	OEO action under consideration.
OEO contract (part) No. 4110, May 11, 1967, Los Angeles Neighborhood Legal Services Society.	12 VISTA volunteers.	Vetoed July 5, 1967.	Veto sustained.
Grant No. CG-705-B/7, Economic Opportunity Commission of San Diego County, Inc.	\$13,074, neighborhood service center.	Carbon copy, Governor's letter of Aug. 21, 1967, recommending disapproval received by regional office. Governor announced veto at subsequent press conference.	Awaiting official action by Governor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas such time as he may require.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. How much time does the distinguished Senator from New Jersey have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would advise the Senator from Texas that the Senator from New Jersey has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As much time as the distinguished Senator needs, he has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act affecting migratory labor are among the most important in the act. Much more must be done in this area, and programs should not be unnecessarily hindered by the adop-

tion of an amendment which would add the Governor's veto to title III(b) programs. More than 7½ million Americans in many States are affected by this provision, for it seeks to give assistance to the families as well as to the workers involved in migratory and seasonal farm labor.

Presently the Office of Economic Opportunity programs have reached fewer than 2 percent of the migrants. Our future programs should reach more migrants with aid particularly in three areas. Housing remains a continuing and degrading problem among migrants. Education must be increased for both adults and youth so that they can pre-

pare themselves adequately for their futures. And day-care assistance must be used to prevent even worse deficiencies among the children left unattended while the rest of the family must labor in the field.

Persons trapped in this means of employment have long suffered inattention in many States. State governments have certainly not been leaders in developing programs for their assistance. Now that the Federal Government has taken the initiative, it would be counter to the basic objectives of the war on poverty, and this act, to place the migrants' fate again in the hands of the Governor.

This is an important question for State government as well. Where there is direct Federal activity, such as the VISTA program, the consent requirement may be justified. It does not transfer to the Governor control over any matter normally assigned elsewhere in State law.

But many types of migrant assistance will count on programs using local agencies and organizations. These local organizations want to help, despite the State government's opposition—this has been true in my State, Mr. President—and they are the key to a comprehensive attack on this problem. Under State law, the Governor would normally have no direct control over such local programs and he would not be expected to be directly responsible for them. This amendment would give him that control and would, therefore, confer more power over a federally assisted program than the Governor enjoys with respect to State action.

In addition to opposing such an amendment in principle, I oppose it because of the way such veto power has operated in practice. It can provide a license for abuse and harassment of programs.

I believe that the Senator from New Jersey has already placed in the RECORD the tables regarding the Governors' vetoes; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes. Let me mention that Alabama had 10 vetoes and California eight. It runs through seven other States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I believe that California had 60 percent of the vetoes; is that not true? Or is it true that California and Alabama combined account for 60 percent of the vetoes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is correct in his latter statement.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And seven more vetoes are pending in California now?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is correct. I will say that these are recent figures. I think we can name the Governors: Mrs. Lurleen Wallace, of Alabama, and Governor Reagan, of California, were the vetoers.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California, provided the time is taken out of the time of the proponents of the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Just 10 seconds. I should like the RECORD to show that insofar as I can ascertain, there has been no collusion between the Governor of California and the Governor of Alabama.

Mr. CLARK. There will be next year, though. [Laughter.]

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, to continue, frequent letters from my own State have indicated that the hindering effects of the politically motivated activities of the Governors under their veto power are in contradiction to our purpose in this act to move forward. Even when not overtly exercised, the veto power has great coercive force. Under threat of veto, program content can be altered, friends can be appointed to projects, enemies of the Governor can be forced to resign, and seemingly endless frustrations and delays can be caused. The main argument for adding veto power to title III(b) is that similar veto power is included in other parts of the act. But if we look at the effect veto power has had on operation of other parts of the act, then one can see precisely why it should be opposed.

In discussions about this amendment, the comment is sometimes made that without veto power under title III(b), programs that were vetoed elsewhere can be resubmitted through this loophole. I would be against any clever reworking of a program merely to sneak it through. But I am even more opposed to the clever ways that a Governor would be able to use this veto power, with all its coercive potential, to render ineffective our plans and attempts to provide this much needed assistance to migrants.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say to the Senator from California that I sympathize with the problems of the tomato growers in California.

Tomatoes are grown in my State also, as the Senator knows. But it is a crop which comes on later than in California, and our plants were placed in the ground just before Hurricane Beulah hit. The crop was utterly destroyed. Now our workers are unemployed.

Last Friday, I addressed a letter to Secretary of Labor Wirtz, requesting that we get some transportation to California for the tomato and farm workers in my State so that they could help to harvest the crops in California. My letter is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, September 29, on page S13938.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from California again, in answer to his plea for the admission of workers from other countries, that he does not have to go to other nations for his help, that Texas is ready, able, and willing to go to work and help to harvest the California crop, if a means of transportation for them can be found.

I thank the Senator from New Jersey for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the forceful statement of the Senator from Texas. I do want to say this which I overlooked in response to the Senator from California: there was a title II program which had application in California by the CCCD. Is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. According to my information, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What do those initials stand for?

Mr. MURPHY. California Center for Community Development.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That

was the program, under title II, that was vetoed by Governor Reagan?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; a refunding grant was vetoed. Then another organization applied for the program, and it was called CCAA.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That was for adult education. Is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. Basically; yes. I have not been able to find out exactly what it is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That came under title III, which does not carry a veto by the Governor as of this date.

Mr. MURPHY. That is right. It proposed to have the same directors, which made me believe that there was a capability provided to circumvent the provisions of the other part of the Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is why I raised this question, because I knew this was in the Senator's prepared remarks. I had a check run on the board of directors of the first organization and the board of directors of the second organization, and there was only one man who was on both the first and the second.

Mr. MURPHY. That was a new board of directors. The original board of directors of the second organization was changed and a new board was appointed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The first project was an application for \$109,000, as I recall.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The adult education program under title III was for about \$1.5 million.

Mr. MURPHY. It was \$1.5 million.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California does not have the floor. The Senator from New Jersey has.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon has asked for time, and I would like to yield to him at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What we need and what we have.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as floor manager of the bill, I yield 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the Senator from California and I have been together on almost all farm migratory problems. Last year a series of amendments sponsored by the Senator from California and other Senators on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee were adopted, after a considerable amount of opposition. But on this one I cannot join the Senator from California, because I have always opposed the Governor's veto power under the legislation and I oppose its extension in this case.

I do not think we can have a program that involves national problems such as are involved in the migratory work program and then segmentize the program.

The bracero program, in the first instance—which I have always defended—came out of my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee. I thought we made a great mistake when it was abolished. I opposed its abolition.

As the Senator from New Jersey [Mr.

WILLIAMS knows, he was on the other side of that one, as he was last year on the migratory labor amendments I offered in committee.

I think it is a mistake to give Governors the veto power. I opposed it in the original bill. I oppose it today. I speak respectfully, but I speak in disagreement with the policies of the Governor of California as announced in a Associated Press dispatch of October 3. I recognize his reasons for doing it, but I do not think they justify the course of action he took. The dispatch reads as follows:

Over the objections of organized labor, California convicts were out in orchards plucking figs to avert what Gov. Ronald Reagan said would be a disaster for growers.

Last week the Governor authorized the use of about 200 prisoners from the minimum-security Deuel Vocational Institution at nearby Tracy to lend a hand in harvesting the ripe fig crop. The men are being paid prevailing wages. Thomas Pitts, secretary-treasurer of the California Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, protested the action. He contended growers hadn't made full efforts to find domestic help.

I think there is a clear duty to do what can be done to provide the workers to meet crop labor emergencies. It has been done in most instances, as far as I know. I do not think that a Governor, instead of going along with a program, would have the power to veto it and then resort to convict labor, is very desirable. It is likely to create more tension between the growers and labor than already exists. I think it is completely unacceptable to do that. I do not believe in this veto power being given to the Governors. I believe in making the Federal program work and in adopting whatever reforms are necessary to make it work, but not by giving the Governors veto power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. A Governor, by utilizing the veto power could have a bad effect on the national program and on national legislation. I do not think we should segmentize it that way.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this time statistics in regard to Governors' vetoes. We have found, for example, that in the community action program, there were 10 vetoes out of Alabama, eight out of California, and three out of Florida out of a total of 30 vetoes.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire material be printed in the RECORD at this point. Time does not permit me to go into detail, but it illustrates the point of the Senator from Oregon's argument that to give power to individual Governors to exercise a veto can jeopardize the entire program.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNORS' VETOES

I. Community Action Program: 30 Vetoes out of over 16,600 grants; of these, 9 were sustained; 4 were overridden in whole and 1 was overridden in part; 2 were accepted as resubmitted; 6 went forward due to the veto being withdrawn or rescinded; 1 was an im-

perfect veto not recognized by OEO; and 7 are still pending (6 in California). Thus, of the 30 vetoes, 23 have reached final disposition, and of these 23, only 5 were overridden and 8 programs have gone forward without use of the override (besides the one imperfect veto).

The CAP vetoes occurred in these States:

Alabama	10
California	8
Florida	3
Louisiana	2
North Dakota	2
Mississippi	1
Kentucky	1
Indiana	1
Missouri	1
Wyoming	1
Total	30

Thus, Alabama accounts for 33 1/3 % of all CAP vetoes, and Alabama and California together account for 60 %. Four Deep South States (Alabama, Florida, Mississippi and Louisiana) account for over 50 %. Those four plus California account for 80 %. All CAP vetoes have occurred in 20 % of the States (10 of 50) in 80 % of all States, there have been no CAP vetoes.

II. VISTA: There have been 2 VISTA vetoes, one in Mississippi, and one partial veto of a 5-State project under OEO Contract #4110: California and Ohio refused participation in a VISTA Associates project (N.Y., N.J., and Pa. accepted). VISTA vetoes are not subject to override. There are currently 420 VISTA Projects.

III. NYC: There have been 2 NYC vetoes, both in 1965 prior to the override authority, one in Texas and one in Montana—as far as we know.

IV. Job Corps: No Job Corps Center has ever been vetoed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to see extended this afternoon the veto power of Governors over such programs, and I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time for the time being.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 5 minutes remaining on his side, and the Senator from California has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to point out to my distinguished friend from Oregon—and I find myself uncomfortable to find him in opposition to me on this, because I generally agree with him wholeheartedly on this—that the amendment I am presenting here really has nothing to do with convict labor in the fields of California to meet an emergency.

If I recall correctly, it was only a year ago that the then Democratic Governor of California suggested the use of convict labor. I do not recall that Mr. Pitts made any loud objection at that time.

I do not favor convict labor. I spoke out at that time. I do not think it is right. But there are many times when farmers face an emergency, when their crops are

rotting in the fields. That is an emergency equivalent to that of a house burning down. Those crops have to be gotten out. It must be done quickly. Sometimes things are done which should not be done. Knowing the Governor of California and having been involved in labor organizations over the last 25 years, I know this goes against his beliefs. But, as Governor of a State, he must put the interests of the entire State first, and the desires of organized labor second.

I yield now to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much times does the Senator yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MURPHY. Five minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to direct an inquiry to the sponsor of the amendment, so that I can be sure I understand it.

The impression may have gone forth, based on some of the remarks that have been made, that the amendment of the Senator from California will give the Governors of the States an absolute veto over projects under title III.

I am aware of the fact that the veto under title I and title II is a very limited veto, which can be overridden by Sargent Shriver, the Director of the poverty program.

The Senator from Oregon referred to a number of instances where Governors' vetoes have been exercised. I would assume that in every one of those cases, Sargent Shriver could have or did override the veto of the Governor in those situations, if he believed the Governor did not have good reason to exercise the veto.

I ask the Senator from California whether or not his amendment would be consistent with the limited veto power that is now available under title I and title II, and whether or not Sargent Shriver, the director of the poverty program, could override the Governor's veto if he believed it was without justification.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, my distinguished friend from Michigan has made an excellent point, and has cleared up what might have been a misunderstanding.

The veto provided in this amendment is a limited veto, conferring exactly the same power, under exactly the same definition, as the vetoes which exist in the other parts of the program.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Then there is no arbitrary right of the Governor to kill a program, or discriminate against it because of racial motives, for example?

Mr. MURPHY. None whatever.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Reference has been made to Governor Wallace of Alabama. The impression may have been left that it might have something to do with race if there were a veto exercised by a Governor. In a situation where that might be the case, is my understanding correct that Sargent Shriver could override such a veto?

Mr. MURPHY. The Senator is correct; he could override the veto. Actually, the Governor's veto is not a veto at all. It merely provides an opportunity for him to object. Sargent Shriver has the right at all times to override the veto.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Senator has correctly stated that it is not a veto at all. That is not even an appropriate name for it. All the Governor can do is say, in effect, "Just a second, here, let us take a look at this; if you want to override my veto, that is your privilege, but here are things I see wrong with it as Governor of the State"; is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Three minutes.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the Senator from California, because I feel that it brings a better balance to this important program. I know that every Senator who has spoken today has a desire to assist in bringing about better coordination between the Federal and State Governments. I also know, from having had experience with OEO programs subject to the Governor's veto—although it was a full veto and not a limited veto at that time—that with it the program had greater flexibility. The veto gave the Governor a meaningful say in programs vitally affecting his State. The Governors of most States have migratory labor committees or commissions that they work with, consequently, a veto authority would assure his local committee the opportunity to investigate any migratory programs to effect their improvement.

We all realize that no Governor is going to take an action that is detrimental to the people involved, nor an action that is detrimental to the voters, if he can avoid doing so.

Therefore, I emphasize that this is an amendment that will bring about the balance so badly needed. I think having the matter arbitrarily determined by a Federal official is not in the best interests of the migratory worker. This is a good amendment, and should have the support of my fellow Senators.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my distinguished friend from Arizona. I am certain that the position of the Governor as he has stated it is generally the case. There may be instances, in some States, where Governors, Senators, and Congressmen do not always see eye to eye. But I think in the overall picture, it should be a matter for the decision of the voters of those States who is right and who is wrong, and I do not think we should write legislation in this Chamber to take care of one or two particular instances. I think rather we should write it with the idea of the general good and the general performance.

I point out, Mr. President, that one of the vetoes the Governor of California exercised had to do with a project in which there were 17 workers, 17 poor people to be benefited, and seven supervisors were assigned to the project—seven supervisors to look after 17 workers. The Governor of California vetoed that project, and I think quite rightly; and I am sure that, after he brought the matter to the attention of Sargent Shriver, he did not insist on overriding the veto.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from California. I do so because I believe the adoption of it will insure a better and more efficient administration of the entire program.

Written into the act already is the right of the Governor of a State to express his opinion about the merits of a proposal coming out of the office of Sargent Shriver. With reference to two of the titles, the right of the Governor to express himself as the chief of his State is already in the law.

The amendment of the Senator from California contemplates giving to the Governor the right of expressing himself on the merits of a proposal with respect to title III, as he has the right to do with respect to title I.

Mr. President, why should not the Governor of a State, chosen by the people, living within it, have the right to express himself on the merits of a proposal made by the Federal Government in the administration of this program? Should he not at least be accorded the dignity of saying, "I believe this program is good" or "I believe it is bad"? That is all he can do, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Michigan. He has no absolute power of veto. All he can do is express an opinion. Sargent Shriver thereafter can finally say, "My judgment shall prevail; the Governor's judgment shall be cast aside. This program must be adopted, whether the State wants it or does not want it."

Are we to adopt a policy of placing tyrannical and absolute powers over the States, without the right of their Governors to complain? I do not think it should be done. Governors have a great responsibility. I assume that they will act with integrity. If they do not, Sargent Shriver, sitting here in Washington, can say, "I reject your thinking; your State must accept this program whether you want it or not."

I commend the Senator from California for sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

I point out that at the outset, when this program was first instituted, it is my understanding that it contained an absolute Governor's veto. I ask my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania to correct me if I am wrong. The next time it came around for action, the veto was taken out.

One of the weaknesses of the program has been its unpopularity, its lack of acceptance in local situations. Were I in Sargent Shriver's position today, I would recommend this veto. He has done it in the other areas of the act. Were I in his position, I would recommend it today, because it would give me a reflection of the feelings of local groups and the feelings of the elected representatives of the

people of a given area. It would give me a chance to further ascertain whether or not the judgment of the people setting up the program was, in the final analysis, in the best interests of the poor who are supposed to be helped, the poor who are supposed to be getting the benefits from these tremendous amounts of money we in the Senate have voted to expend.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon. Then I reserve the remainder of my time for myself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, very briefly, in answer to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from California, what we sought to do in the first place was to get arrangements whereby the Governors could make known or have an opportunity to make known to Mr. Shriver their views in regard to a project. We did not try to give them the so-called veto power because the veto power does provide for another step in the administration where a review commission is set up to determine whether a veto should stand.

What has happened is that too many times this has been used for a political battleground. We have a Federal policy and a Governor is politically against the administration of the whole program. So he capitalizes on it politically. That provision ought to be removed from the program.

I said when we were fighting the veto battle in the first place that I was for a program whereby a Governor would be given an opportunity to make known his view to Mr. Shriver.

But I do not think it ought to be done through the procedure of a veto to require a veto commission to have the Governor overruled on the recommendations. That is where politics enters, and we ought to keep all politics out.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President the committee has wrestled with this problem of the Governor's veto now for the better part of 3 years. It is a very controversial subject, and the importance of the veto varies to a certain extent with the nature of the program.

The Murphy amendment is very restricted in that it applies only to migratory labor projects under title III(b) of the pending bill.

This in turn affects migratory labor programs in about 30 States. There are only about three States in which this has occurred. They are California, Alabama, and Florida.

The difficulty with accepting the amendment is that it throws the whole migratory labor problem right into the middle of partisan politics, because those Governors who are opposed to any rea-

sonable regulation of migratory labor practices within the States are the very ones who want this veto.

It is for that reason that the committee felt it was unwise to change the present situation as it concerns the veto with respect to the migratory labor problem.

If we were able to handle the situation in Alabama, California, and Florida, there would be no problem. However, the fact of the matter is that the Governors of those States are not receptive to modern working conditions, such as wages and the like, for migratory labor. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has told me that this amendment would be very difficult for those who would like to see the working conditions of migratory labor improve. I believe him.

I therefore hope that the amendment will be rejected.

I think the Senator from California has made a pretty good legal argument. However, the fact of the matter is that the amendment will be defeated because migratory labor, in at least those three States, would be prejudiced.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from California has no time remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California may have as much time as he desires.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how much time will that be?

Mr. MURPHY. Three minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, recently in the Senate Chamber I successfully restored a temporary housing project which had been taken out of the OEO. It had strong support of the State of California.

It is a housing project which our committee visited. We looked at this housing project. However, the OEO, being 3,000 miles away, had taken it out.

I believe we all concurred that it was an excellent project.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from California and I just put it back in again.

Mr. MURPHY. That was the exact point of my argument.

There is no absolute veto here. This merely gives a Governor a chance to point out matters with respect to a project.

This project with 17 people certainly should not have seven supervisors. The Governor wants the chance to point out that it is a waste of the taxpayers' money to put this money into administration and into all sorts of programs with which we are not familiar. That is the only reason I put the provision in.

I know that it is not an absolute veto. It is merely a procedure by which the Governor can say, "Well, look, Mr. Shriver. I don't think this is in our best interest."

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I think we are about out of time. I suggest that we vote. The persuasive argument of the Senator from California has not persuaded me.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, is there any more time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I merely want to correct an impression that perhaps was given when the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was discussing the wages paid farmers in California. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that it is a low wage scale?

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator misunderstood me. What I intended to say was that California, Alabama, and Florida are States in which, if we give the Governors even a qualified veto, we will not get much in the way of favorable treatment of working conditions and other conditions for migratory labor that we have tried to achieve in 30 States.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator realizes that California, from the standpoint of competitive conditions, has the highest farm labor wage rates in the Nation.

When I was Governor of Arizona, the minimum wage for the country went to \$1.40 an hour, while Texas was paying \$0.75.

Mr. CLARK. I have no basis for disagreeing with the statement of the Senator from Arizona about the wages in California. I only add that California has one of the most unusual Governors among the 50 States.

Mr. FANNIN. That is the opinion of the Senator. I would not agree with the Senator on that. I think Governor Reagan is one of the outstanding Governors in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. I think the word "unusual" is quite complimentary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, with one possible exception, there be a time limitation of 30 minutes on each amendment, the time to be equally divided between

the Senator who offers the amendment and the floor manager of the bill, the agreement to begin after the conclusion of the vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator restate that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation on each amendment of 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the Senator who offers the amendment and the floor manager of the bill, with one exception which we are still working out.

Mr. CLARK. That means 15 minutes to a side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that if we agree to the unanimous-consent request the majority leader will, and I shall, be lenient with Senators who urge us to give them a minute or two more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 45, as follows:

[No. 278 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken	Griffin	Murphy
Allott	Hansen	Pearson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Percy
Boggs	Hill	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Scott
Carlson	Hollings	Smathers
Church	Hruska	Smith
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Spong
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Dominick	Lausche	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Fannin	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fong	Mundt	

NAYS—45

Anderson	Hart	Monroney
Bartlett	Hartke	Montoya
Bayh	Hayden	Morse
Bible	Inouye	Muskie
Brewster	Jackson	Nelson
Burdick	Javits	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Cannon	Long, La.	Randolph
Case	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Clark	Mansfield	Symington
Cooper	McCarthy	Tydings
Dodd	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McGovern	Yarborough
Gruening	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Harris	Mondale	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—14

Baker	Hatfield	*Moss
Brooke	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Ellender	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell
Ervin	Metcalf	Tower
Gore	Morton	

So Mr. MURPHY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Maryland.

SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, an article entitled "West Virginia's Byrd Gains Key Role in Senate," published in this morning's Washington Post, describes the extraordinary energy, diligence, and devotion which our distinguished colleague, Senator ROBERT BYRD, of West Virginia, has applied to his important duties as assistant majority whip in the Senate and as chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations. As the article points out:

The indefatigable West Virginian never takes any job lightly and has an almost Victorian concept of "duty."

I commend this interesting article to the attention of my fellow Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARD WORKER IN ASCENDANCY: WEST VIRGINIA'S BYRD GAINS KEY SENATE ROLE
(By Robert C. Albright)

Ever so quietly over a brief 9-month span, Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.), has emerged

as the recognized though uncrowned deputy leader of the Senate.

The 49-year-old Byrd, in the Senate 9 years now, has converted his once comparatively minor Party post of Secretary of the Senate Democratic Conference into an assignment of major importance. Some already are saying the West Virginia conservative will be the man to beat for his Party's next top Senate leadership vacancy.

Byrd will be in the Senate limelight today, when the chamber debates his motion to kill a \$2.8 billion emergency job program added to the anti-poverty bill by the Labor Committee. [For poverty bill developments, see Page A7.]

Byrd's gradual ascent to a leading role in the Senate was achieved by dint of long, lunchless working hours in constant Senate attendance and by full consultation and clearance with the chamber's two top Democratic leaders.

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (Mont.), has always welcomed help in his more wearing floor duties. Senate Majority Whip Russell B. Long (La.), No. 2 in command, continues free to step in to relieve Mansfield at any time, but generally yields the assist job to Byrd.

"Byrd is completely loyal to Mike and carries out all of his instructions to the letter," said one Party insider.

Byrd already has become in effect the man who runs the Senate during most of its 9 to 5 normal working hours. In the process he has become the man most fellow Democrats seek out to "protect their interests" and to perform the innumerable other big and small favors expected from a working floor leader. As some put it, he's made himself "the indispensable man."

WON OUT OVER CLARK

Only last January, Byrd, a conservative on most issues, won out in the Senate Democratic caucus over Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.), an outspoken liberal, for the post of conference secretary.

Seldom has a party job been more sharply contested, even though the No. 3 spot was not then regarded as a springboard for leadership and power. It was always potentially so, however, for the conference secretary along with the Party's top leaders are among the Capitol's select who have the ear of the President at the weekly White House legislative conferences.

Byrd's friends say that the indefatigable West Virginian never takes any job lightly and has an almost Victorian concept of "duty".

This has extended to the District Appropriations Subcommittee, which Byrd has headed for the last seven years.

Despite his ever-increasing duties in the Senate, this year he conducted the most detailed, line-by-line, hearings ever held on the city's budget. He has maintained his absolute control over the city's welfare policies, and has continued his strong interest in upgrading education in the District.

When Byrd was elected conference secretary, Mansfield already had four "assistant whips" from the moderate to liberal wing of the Party, ready to sit in for the leaders on a call or standby basis.

They were, and still are, Sens. Philip A. Hart (D-Mich.), Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.), Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii) and Daniel B. Brewster (D-Md.).

For a time after Byrd's election they offered to assist occasionally when and if the need arose. But with Byrd available on a virtually around-the-clock basis, they have ceased even to make the gesture.

During Mansfield's recent foreign relations study tour "around Asia's rim," Byrd functioned altogether as acting leader of the Senate for an unbroken ten days.

Nor does Byrd confine himself entirely to leadership routine. Last week when he moved to recommit the Senate Labor Com-

mittee's \$5 billion antipoverty bill, with instruction to delete Clark's \$2.8 billion emergency job program, it was clear that he reflected Administration wishes. He said he decided to make the motion on his own.

Before presenting his motion, however, he dutifully cleared it with Mansfield.

From the moment Byrd was elected he regretted his new job as a challenge, moved over to the Senate floor almost full time, and placed himself completely at the disposal of the leadership.

Byrd uses his mornings for office chores, and committee hearings, then generally takes over in the Senate at noon. He seldom leaves the chamber until it adjourns, anywhere from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. Then he goes back to his office for more homework. He's usually the last man to leave the Capitol, after putting in a 12-hour day.

In his West Virginia "hill" philosophy, it takes a big man and hard work to make a big job out of a little job. Back home he applied himself so assiduously that in 1964 he was reelected to the Senate by the biggest vote ever cast for a West Virginia candidate.

When he set out to bat for Mansfield he boned up on the Senate's strange and often devious rules until he'd mastered them. Whenever in doubt, he goes to school again with Senate Parliamentarian Floyd M. Riddick.

Mansfield heartily approves of his performance.

"Bob Byrd does a first rate job," said Mansfield. "He is of great assistance to me, and he takes a great load off my shoulders. I am glad he is getting a little recognition."

One significant reason for Byrd's growing acceptance is a little notebook he carries around in his pocket.

TO EACH HIS OWN

On separate pages are listed the names of all Senators. Lest he forget, he jots down the requests any one of them makes, no matter how minor.

One Senator is taking a group of constituents to lunch, wants to be called if a given measure comes up.

Another wants to be alerted by a quorum call when there's a business break, so he can make a prepared speech.

Another has an important out-of-town engagement, wants his "position protected" during his absence.

Still another is seeking a "live pair" on the poverty bill while he's away.

Byrd dutifully jots down each request, sees to it meticulously that each is fulfilled. One of these days all those favors will pay dividends.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no pending amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may be recognized for not in excess of 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, an order has been entered that on all amendments except one from now on—and that includes amendments to be offered by the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and perhaps others—there be a time limitation of one-half hour, with the time to be equally divided on each amendment. There was one exception at the time and I feel somewhat embarrassed, but no matter which direction the leadership moves, it comes up against a proposition which is hard to find an answer to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL
9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour at that time not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there are no other amendments to be considered at that time I ask that the Williams amendment become the pending business and that a vote take place not later than 45 minutes after that, the time to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not object. I do not know yet whether I will be here but I wish the RECORD to show that for personal reasons which are very well known I have asked the majority leader to extend that time to the afternoon. The majority leader and the minority leader find themselves unable to do so. I have the deepest and most devoted feeling about the passage of this bill as being essential to the Nation. That is why I shall not object. I wanted that statement to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from New York that we are fully familiar with the situation confronting him. I wish it were possible to expedite this matter and at the same time make it possible to accede to his desires and request. The Senator expressed a hope rather than a formal request. It is one of the difficulties with which we have to deal in moving Senate business forward. The RECORD should note that the Senator's reasons are the very highest.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator amend his statement to show that I did make the request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; the Senator did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join the minority leader in expressing thanks and appreciation for the understanding of the 'distinguished senior Senator from New York. His reasons are of the highest which could be found.

Mr. President, I wish that the calendar was such that we could do something to accede to the Senator's request. Unfortunately, we find ourselves in a position, as I indicated earlier, so that no matter which way we turn we come up against an obstacle which is a little difficult to overcome.

Mr. President, has the request been granted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, now that the request has been granted, the Senate will be on notice that not later than 10:30 tomorrow morning, bearing unforeseen developments, there may

very well be a vote on the Williams amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be votes today. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does the majority leader contemplate that immediately after the Williams amendment is disposed of we will go to third reading and have final passage tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would hope for that, but that is up to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I had intended to add to the previous unanimous-consent request to which the Senate agreed that 1 hour of debate be allowed on the bill, the time to be equally divided between the majority and minority leaders or whomever they designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 536) to provide that the United States shall hold certain Chilocco Indian School lands at Chilocco, Okla., in trust for the Cherokee Nation upon payment by the Cherokee Nation of \$3.75 per acre to the Federal Government; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HALEY, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. McCLURE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 117. An act for the relief of Martha Blankenship;

S. 534. An act for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka); and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 68, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following: new subsection:

"(d) The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers. Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project."

On page 68, line 13, strike out "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

On page 69, line 6, strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

On page 69, line 6, strike out "10 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "15 per centum".

On page 69, line 8, after the period insert the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the sums appropriated pursuant to this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$50,000,000 shall be available only for projects authorized under subsection (d) of this section."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

This is a revision of amendment No. 348 which we discussed for about 1 hour earlier in the week. It provides for the transference of \$50 million authorized to be appropriated to OEO to a special program designed to benefit the rural areas and to prevent the flow of vast numbers of rural inhabitants from the places where they are now located to the ghettos of the cities to further complicate the multitude of problems which are there. The \$50 million would not increase the cost of the bill but merely earmark \$50 million which is already in the bill.

Mr. President, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 contain several helpful provisions which focus on rural poverty. The committee report states that rural programs should be strengthened and expanded and that rural areas should receive a more equitable share of financing than they have in the past. I commend the members of the subcommittee for reaching these conclusions. They are of utmost importance to the Nation.

I believe, however, that an even greater push is needed. Under my amendment, a new subsection would be added to section 232 of the bill, on page 68 at line 12, stating that:

The Director shall conduct, either directly or through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot projects designed to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity, thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers.

The amendment, in which my colleague, Mr. HARRIS, joins, further directs that:

Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with other Federally assisted programs, particularly programs authorized under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1966, in the area to be served by the project.

On page 69, line 6, the amount available for carrying out section 232 would be changed from a ceiling of 10 percent of the sums appropriated for any OEO program to 15 percent. A sentence would be added on line 8 stating that \$50 million of the funds appropriated pursuant to title II would be available for projects authorized under the new subsection.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas who has pending a bill on tax credit legislation, which I have joined him in cosponsoring, to try to encourage industry to come into rural areas to relieve the migration to our already overcrowded metropolitan centers.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. As he commented and observed, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] is a cosponsor of the amendment and joined in introducing legislation which sought to recognize that the crisis in the cities has become almost a slogan for America in the great urban areas of the country over the past 2, 3, and 4 years, that it has a direct relationship to rural problems to develop migration of those seeking to come into the ghettos of the large metropolitan cities which has accelerated and accentuated the problem.

It is not a case of keeping them "down on the farm." It is a case of seeking to develop those potentialities they have not only at the core of our great cities, but also in the rural areas.

I commend the Senator for this particular amendment. I intend to support it, and I thank him for having offered it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague for his support.

Mr. President, let me emphasize at the outset that this amendment does not increase in any way the cost of the bill. The \$50 million for the program, as the amendment is now drafted, would come out of the community action authorization. The amendment as I originally introduced it would have taken the \$50 million from the Job Corps authorization. I still have great doubts about the Job Corps program. I think it is one of the least effective programs we have. I believe, however, that it is the will of the Senate at the present time, especially in view of the tremendous capital investment we have in Job Corps camps around the country, that this questionable program be given another chance to prove its worth. It is for this reason that I have redrafted the amendment.

The Economic Opportunity Act calls for an all-out attack against the sources of poverty in the United States. But the main thrust of this attack since the program's inception in 1964 has been aimed primarily at the Nation's urban centers. Little has been done in rural areas. I agree completely with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], in his introduc-

tory remarks on the Rural Job Development Act:

The root cause of many of the problems of the large cities today can be traced to the problems of rural America.

That is where our attack on poverty should begin. That is the real challenge—to reverse the forced migration to the slums and ghettos of the large cities. In order to do this, however, greater opportunities must be provided in the rural areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I commend my able colleague from Oklahoma on the introduction of his amendment and the perfection of it. I ask that I be privileged to become a cosponsor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am delighted to have the distinguished Senator from West Virginia as a cosponsor. The senior Senator from West Virginia has contributed greatly to the Appalachia program and other economic development programs. He has always been in the forefront in aiding rural America. If he will ask for permission from the Chair, I am sure that it will be granted by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to join my colleague from Oklahoma in cosponsoring the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I certainly support the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. I might point out that 5 years ago, at the time we were considering amendments to the Area Development Act, I proposed an amendment quite similar to the one now pending. I regret to say that the leadership did not see fit to accept it. I say that with the clear understanding that I do not mean that the Senator from Oklahoma did not wish to see that amendment adopted. I tried the same thing 3 years ago, and at that time was assured that efforts were being made by the Department of Agriculture under the rural area development program to achieve the objectives that we were seeking to achieve.

I regret to say that those objectives have not been achieved so that the pending amendment is very much in order. It is too bad that something like this was not done a long time ago. Because of my long and continued interest in this very approach to the problem, I wonder whether the Senator would be good enough to permit me to be a cosponsor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would be honored

to have my distinguished colleague as a cosponsor of the pending amendment because of the work he has done so faithfully in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] be added as a cosponsor of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank both the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from West Virginia who have both done so much in the field of rural development and in the struggle to try to improve the economy of the rural areas.

I was interested to read in last week's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that according to a recent report of the Economic Development Agency, it has been the push of hopelessness, of discouragingly poor rural conditions rather than the pull of urban economic opportunities that produced the migration of more than 10 million persons from rural to metropolitan areas in the 1950-60 decade.

Few Americans in our increasingly urbanized society are aware of the abject poverty in rural areas. Today almost half of the Nation's poor live in small towns, on farms, or in nonfarm rural areas. Most of these are the invisible poor. They do not often make headlines. We do not pass them as we make our way from the suburbs into our financial and business centers. They are easy to ignore. But they are there—spread out all across our land. These are truly the forgotten Americans.

Mr. President, we must encourage, we must establish, programs and projects which will enable farmworkers and other rural inhabitants whose jobs have been abolished by increased mechanization and advanced technology to find work near their homes. We cannot afford to continue to drive these people into the ghettos of the cities. Rural America must be reenergized. By harnessing local private initiative together with various State and Federal agencies, much can be done in this effort. But before the problem is compounded any further, we must get started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, just a few days ago, the Senate voted 77 to 25 to increase the model cities program from \$237 to \$537 million. I have supported the model cities concept because it is obvious that existing urban renewal programs have been inadequate to halt the cancerous spread of urban blight, and new methods of dealing with the crisis of the cities must be tried on an emergency basis.

But a program of model rural community development is equally important. This Nation cannot develop model cities until it also makes a greater effort to develop model rural areas. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The pending amendment authorizing and directing research and pilot projects to assure a more effective use of human and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migration from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity is timely and thoroughly meaningful. Congress could not give the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity a more useful and important mission than that of directing research and setting up pilot projects to find ways to make family life in the rural and semirural areas of our country more satisfying and pleasant. Among the actions we must take in the United States are those which will slow down the migration of rural oriented citizens into the already overcrowded cities if we are to solve the problems of the ghettos and the disturbances in city streets.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague and agree with his comments.

I thank the able Senator for his cogent remarks.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute from my time to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I just wanted to say to the Senator that I think he has now perfected his amendment in such a way as to make it satisfactory to the friends of the program and to do what he desires to do. I am very pleased to see it generally accepted on the floor, and I join in accepting it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I deeply appreciate the remarks of the Senator and his acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be added as one of the authors of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield now to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished senior colleague in support of this amendment. I commend him for bringing it before the Senate and for the excellent groundwork he has laid for its passage here today. I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his great help on this amendment.

RURAL AGRICULTURAL POVERTY IS NO MYTH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma for proposing this amendment to slow the migration from rural areas to our overburdened cities. I strongly support its passage.

The plight of persons in rural areas often escapes legislative attention. This amendment not only recognizes a critical problem, but meets it in a constructive and practical way.

This problem of migration calls attention once again to the pervasive poverty

in rural areas that is so severe it causes persons to flee toward any hope of a better life.

Anyone who thinks present conditions are adequate is a victim of one of the most persistent and unrealistic of American myths concerning poverty in the United States. The myth is that rural poverty is decidedly limited in our country and what there is of it is not severe.

The myth undoubtedly flows from our unwillingness to accept the idea that in the midst of much of the world's richest farmland and surrounded by agricultural abundance there can be thousands upon thousands of poverty-stricken and even hungry Americans.

But the tragic fact is that there are scores of thousands of impoverished men, women and children barely surviving in areas of agricultural affluence and there are hungry people living in a country producing such fabulous quantities of food that it can feed millions of starving people in other lands.

Mr. President, rural poverty is a pressing concern today and is likely to become increasingly urgent in the future as mechanization, and even automation, take over more and more kinds of farming and more and more acres of food production.

For these reasons the pending bill, S. 2388, the Emergency Employment Act it incorporates, and this amendment in particular, are profoundly important not alone in terms of urban poverty but also in terms of impoverishment in farm areas and country communities.

And here, Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute not only to the breadth and comprehension of this legislation but also to the wisdom and thoroughness of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, which held hearings on the antipoverty program in nearly all sections of the country, from border to border and from coast to coast. The subcommittee's distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] made certain that the testimony received by his subcommittee was not confined to the problems—overwhelming as they are—of poverty in our metropolitan ghettos. He insisted on extensive testimony dealing with rural poverty and, in fact, together with other members of his subcommittee personally inspected situations of rural impoverishment. He and other members of the subcommittee personally talked with agricultural workers and migrant farmhands and their families, and inspected the shacks and hovels and dilapidated camps these men, women, and children are forced to live in. This subcommittee's proposed legislation, as a result, is not based merely on hearsay evidence; it is based upon first-hand experience of rural poverty along dusty country roads of the East, the South, the North, and the West.

Therefore, Mr. President, this bill demands our respect as legislation that is based on present and urgent realities, on present and urgent needs that members of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty are personally familiar with.

With this as background I would like to review some of the accomplishments that have already been registered in the war

on rural poverty. It is wise that we engage in such a review in order to understand what kind of a start we have made and how far we have come in the fight to eradicate penury and economic injustice in the Nation's farm areas.

Mr. President, roughly 43 percent of this Nation's poor live in rural areas. The rural poor, who typically exist far from the main currents of American life in deprivation as grim and unrelenting as it is invisible to the affluent majority, are found in the Mississippi Delta and mountainous Appalachia, in southwestern deserts and in northern Michigan, in California's central valley and Alabama's Black Belt, in migrant labor camps and on Indian reservations, sometimes in sizable concentrations but more often in isolated pockets of poverty in hundreds and hundreds of rural communities scattered all across the Nation.

For these Americans—nearly 13 million of them—living in quiet and terrible desperation—the pending bill is of absolutely crucial importance, and a vote against this bill, Mr. President, is a vote against them, at least some of whom are represented by practically every Member of this body.

This bill would continue and slightly expand the economic opportunity programs which have become vital to the hopes and aspirations of our rural poor. In fiscal year 1967, \$248.6 million in community action funds were granted to support rural community action programs. This was 32 percent of all community action program money, up from 27 percent in fiscal 1966. During the current fiscal year the figure will climb to about 36 percent of all community action program funds.

Thus from ground zero less than 3 years ago, OEO has assisted in the development of 618 rural community action agencies, covering 1,551 counties, about two-thirds of all U.S. counties designated as rural. This is an especially impressive accomplishment in light of the fact that the struggle against rural poverty is greatly complicated by isolation and a dearth of existing antipoverty organizational structures, as well as a lack of educational, vocational, and social services. For this reason, many rural community action agencies operate on a multi-county basis to assure maximum use of limited local resources. In fiscal 1968, 50 new rural community action agencies will cover about 350 additional rural counties—if the pending bill is approved.

Mr. President, rural community action programs take many forms. In Tennessee, for example, the Elk River Valley Authority uses Federal, State, and local resources to serve the poor in 10 counties having a combined population of 225,000. Approximately one-half of this population lives in poverty, and one-fifth of the families earn less than \$1,000 per year. In this community action agency, the neighborhood center has become the focal point for community action: four primary centers and 28 subcenters offer job placement, consumer education, homemaking and education programs. The community action agency also operates Upward Bound and Neighborhood Youth Corps programs as well as

an Outreach program for mothers of Headstart enrollees. Other rural community action agencies offer different combinations of programs to meet particular needs.

In Michigan, an organization called UPCAP—Upper Peninsula Committee for Area Progress—coordinates the activities of six local, multicounty community action agencies. UPCAP, whose origins predate passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, and the community action agencies work jointly to provide an administrative structure by which resources can be mobilized and programs implemented. They are assisted by U.S. Department of Agriculture personnel, particularly the Extension Service, and State representatives of education, housing, and manpower programs. Because of the "umbrella agency" structure and coordination activities, when a suitable program is developed for the Upper Peninsula area, it can be used by all six local areas.

In Leslie, Knott, Letcher, and Perry Counties in Eastern Kentucky, a multicounty Community Action Council with headquarters in Whitesburg has received a grant of \$73,733 which will enable it to undertake the first rural housing demonstration project in the Nation. The council will plan and develop realistic programs for eliminating rural slums in Appalachia. An areawide, multicounty nonprofit corporation will be organized under the council's auspices to conduct the 7-month program, which will utilize a low-cost prototype house especially designed for the needs of the area.

In Minnesota, the Mahube Community Action Agency, after a year's operation of an excellent home health aid program, has 23 trained home health aides to serve low-income families in Mahnomen, Hubbard, and Becker Counties. During this year, 1,815 nursing visits have been made to homes of the poor, with 51 percent of them to persons of 65 years or over.

In Oregon, the community action team of Columbia County has launched a truly comprehensive program of self-help efforts, including a smaller communities survey of employment services. This project has produced a countywide listing of employers, jobs available, and skill levels required, as well as employee skills and skills of the currently unemployed. A projection of future employment needs has also been made. A new employment office at St. Helens now has a full-time agent, and each community center maintains a list of small jobs available locally.

Other services on which antipoverty agencies and the communities have worked together are adult education, legal service, and improved service in the surplus commodity distribution program. A survey is now in process looking toward a home help aid program for the elderly.

In Rainier, Oreg., the center has rented an aged two-room building in which it held the first well-baby clinic in Columbia County. It offers a home nursing course, and with the help of the county extension service, nutrition classes are available as well as other homemaking projects.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars in Vernonia donated a building for the com-

munity center, and in St. Helens the Odd Fellows gave a building.

Moving on to the rural areas of other States, we find tremendously promising comprehensive health service programs have been launched by local Community Action Agencies with OEO funds in Belmont County, Ohio; Muskegon, Mason, Manistee, Lake, and Newaygo Counties in Michigan; Raleigh County, W. Va.; Alviso County, Calif.; Lowndes County, Ala.; and Bolivar County, Miss. To be set up as health centers in rural target areas, the projects will provide the one door of entry to virtually all health services needed by rural low-income citizens and their families—preventive, curative, rehabilitation, dental care, mental services, home care, drugs and appliances, and, when necessary, hospitalization.

Common to all the comprehensive health services programs is the training of low-income workers as health aides, dental aides, medical clerks and in a variety of other duties related to the running of the health center. One of the most effective jobs these workers do is to go out into the community, inform their neighbors of the center and its services, and get them to participate.

Mr. President, the entire range of Community Action programs is at work in rural America, instilling hope, strengthening communities economically and socially, and providing a wide range of cooperative, self-help exits from poverty. Head Start, Upward Bound, Legal Services, Foster Grandparents, Health Services, and a vast array of locally initiated and directed efforts are moving forward against great obstacles because community action prevails. In testimony before the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor in July, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said:

OEO's Community Action Programs and the USDA's Technical Action Panels are working together to help create a new dimension in rural life. Community Action Agencies are making it possible for rural people to share in the benefits of many Federal programs which formerly were out of reach because the people did not know they existed or lacked the know-how to take advantage of them. They are reaching and stirring hope in the poor who otherwise were hopeless and forsaken.

Mr. President, other Economic Opportunity programs are making significant contributions to the war on rural poverty. As of the end of fiscal 1967, at least 13,200 rural youth were enrolled in Job Corps Centers, and a total of about 26,000 rural youth had been in the Job Corps since its inception. And many Job Corps Conservation Centers are performing an enormously valuable service to rural America through work in conservation projects.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has provided jobs for 250,000 high-school-aged rural youth since the program began. They may work in a school cafeteria, or as an aide to a home demonstration agency, or help build a community water system, such as the one the Reverend Billy Graham and Sargent Shriver visited recently at Blevins Creek in North Carolina.

In January of this year, 52,000 rural young people were enrolled in Neighbor-

hood Youth Corps, receiving wages of \$2.8 million per month. This represents 31.6 percent of the total Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollement. The work experience program under title V of the Economic Opportunity Act is reaching into hundreds of rural communities. Forty percent of all funded training spaces have been allotted to rural America. Since the inception of the program, almost \$50 million in work-experience funds have gone into projects in the 182 poorest counties in the Nation.

Nearly one-third of the strength of VISTA is in rural areas, with more than 1,000 volunteers assigned to 135 projects in 34 States, as of the beginning of this fiscal year.

Through the OEO program of rural loans, administered through the Farmers Home Administration, nearly \$80 million has gone to 37,900 low-income families and 740 cooperatives. These loans are financing investments in farming and about 350 different types of nonfarming enterprises. The money is made available to rural men and women who never before could have qualified for a loan, giving them now an opportunity to become self-sufficient and to rise out of poverty.

Mr. President, all these programs, as well as the highly successful employment programs administered by the Labor Department under the Economic Opportunity Act—including the Nelson amendment, Project Green Thumb, and Operation Mainstream programs of such great benefit to rural antipoverty efforts—all these would be extended and expanded under the pending bill. But the bill places a new sense of urgency and priority on rural programs, and requires the Director of OEO to undertake special efforts to increase the effectiveness of rural antipoverty programs. In particular, the committee report on the bill urges the Director to act under the Community Action title to establish pilot projects in rural areas, to give preference to rural areas in providing technical assistance and personnel training, to develop model programs easily adaptable to rural communities, and to use simplified procedures, forms, and guidelines for rural areas.

Mr. President, the importance of the pending bill to nearly 13,000,000 Americans living in rural poverty cannot be exaggerated. The bill will not wipe out poverty overnight—in rural areas any more than in urban areas—but it will permit the very encouraging efforts launched less than 3 years ago to be continued, and in many cases expanded.

It will constitute a ringing reaffirmation of the commitment this body made in 1964 to eradicate poverty in the United States. Mr. President, I strongly urge the prompt passage of S. 2388. And this amendment by my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma provides a strengthening of the tools we will have to help rural Americans lift themselves out of poverty.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has modified the amendment he originally proposed, so that it now calls for a useful and salutary program to devote \$50 million to rural undertakings with emphasis on

jobs, which one hopes will slow down the rush to the cities from rural areas.

I am happy to accept the amendment, having talked to many members of the subcommittee about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I want to express my absolute support of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

I regret that there were not more Senators present to hear the proposal made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. It has been my distinct impression also that we are aggravating the problems of metropolitan communities by excessive feeding of money into them, thus encouraging increasing immigration from rural areas into the cities.

The city of Cleveland now has a population of 37 percent of the primary minority group. The more money we feed in there, the greater the immigration will be. A policy should be adopted, and an effort made to put it into effect, that will discourage immigration and aid the solution of employment problems in the local communities, which differ from those in the metropolitan centers.

Mr. President, if the Federal Government feeds \$5 billion into the metropolitan communities for the purpose of aiding the poor, what will that \$5 billion do toward inducing excessive immigration to the big cities? And, if the immigration is motivated and induced among those that are told that there is \$5 billion available there, will that produce increased population and thus aggravate the problems of the big cities?

There is a natural trend of the people in the rural areas to move into the metropolitan communities. The metropolitan communities have not been able to digest satisfactorily the great immigration that has occurred.

The error of what we are doing is accentuated by the natural tendency of the rural people to move into the metropolitan areas because billions of dollars have been fed into the metropolitan communities and have enhanced the reason for moving there.

Mr. President, Cleveland has been labeled as unfair to the primary minority group. The fact is, however, that in the last 3 years 75,000 more members of the primary minority group have moved into the city. They believe it is good for them and that they will find comfort, economic advancement, and salvation there. The fact is, however, that eventually trouble will be experienced.

I subscribe heavily to the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma. Let us do something to induce industry to establish itself in the rural communities and not in the big communities. If we do, we will, to a substantial degree, solve the problem of the metropolitan area.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back my time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, offered for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call up another amendment, which I send to the clerk's desk, for myself and my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 74, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following new paragraph:

"(7) No financial assistance shall be extended under this title in any case in which the Director determines that the costs of developing and administering all of the programs assisted under this title carried on by or under the supervision of any community action agency exceed 15 percent of the total costs, including non-federal contributions to such costs, of such programs. The Director, after consultation with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall establish by regulation, criteria for determining (i) the costs of developing and administering such programs, and (ii) the total costs of such programs. In any case in which the Director determines that the cost of administering such programs does not exceed 15 percent of such total costs but is, in his judgment, excessive, he shall forthwith require such community action agency to take such steps prescribed by him as will eliminate such excessive administrative cost, including the sharing by one or more such community action agencies of a common director and other administrative personnel. The Director may waive the limitation prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time not to exceed six months whenever he determines that such a waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this title."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this amendment, in which my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, Senator HARRIS, joins, would put an absolute limit on the administrative overhead costs of Community Action Agency programs. It provides that no financial assistance shall be extended under title II for any program where the cost of developing and administering the program exceeds 15 percent of the total cost. By total cost we include non-Federal contributions and participation in all such programs.

This amendment is consistent with an earlier amendment which was adopted to this bill which provides for an investigation and evaluation by the General Accounting Office of Office of Economic Opportunity expenditures in order to determine the efficiency of the administration of OEO programs.

The GAO, at my request, has been examining Community Action Agency spending in Oklahoma for several months. More than a year ago, it became apparent that the Community Action program was being established in such

a way that a continuing high overburden would be required in many areas to keep it going. This is not the case in every locality by any means. Speaking generally, it is my observation that Community Action programs can be operated more efficiently and with less overhead in the more populous areas than in non-metropolitan or rural areas.

Inevitably, administrative costs are going to be high in the beginning of any new program of governmental action. To launch a program of public works where only brick and mortar or structures or roads or buildings are to be the end results necessitates heavy administrative outlays in the beginning. This is no less true when we seek to establish and implement programs directed to the far less indefinable but tremendously more important objective of human resource development.

Therefore, criticism of administrative costs which have been encountered up to this point in the war on poverty should be tempered with an understanding of the extremely difficult organizational problems involved. Nevertheless, rigid and severe cost accounting methods must be adopted by OEO and it is incumbent upon Congress to provide specific guidelines as to what administrative and developmental costs should be.

The GAO has told me that in its preliminary inquiries in rural areas in my State of Oklahoma administrative costs up to this point have run as high as 25 percent. This is largely a result of decisions made either at the State or local level under terms of the 1964 act which provided for maximum local initiative in the establishment of community action agencies. Far too often the Federal administrative structure of the war on poverty has been blamed for administrative or supervisory conditions which actually were generated largely on the basis of technical assistance provided in most States from the office of the Governor. In Oklahoma, OEO funds in excess of \$300,000 have been spent through the Governor's office in order to provide a degree of local initiative far greater than is generally recognized.

Administrative costs in community action programs have been established on the basis of local decisions, and it is my firm opinion that the OEO as a Federal agency has not had sufficient control over such costs.

This amendment would remedy that situation. It would provide that the Director shall consult with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and then establish by regulation criteria for determining the developmental and administrative costs of such programs. In addition to the flat 15-percent limitation, the amendment provides that even if such costs do not exceed 15 percent and yet are, in the judgment of OEO, excessive, the Director can require community action agencies to reduce administrative expenditures. This includes the right of the OEO Director to require one or more such community action agencies to share a common director and other administrative staff people.

Senator HARRIS and I propose in this manner to strengthen community action administration in nonmetropolitan areas

where up to this time many of the administrative units have been too small and too limited by budget to be effective. A staff-sharing program already has been tried on a very limited basis, I am advised. Also, I have personally examined, in Oklahoma, community action agencies of varying sizes. It is my opinion, on the basis of firsthand examination, that the multicounty administrative unit often proves more efficient in the less populous areas.

Mr. President, it is the purpose of this amendment to make community action agencies as cost-efficient as we would want any business to be. We must make certain that community action agencies do not turn into patronage refuges for a lot of useless people who hold down desk jobs and drain money off from the real business of helping the poor. If ever there was a program that ought to stay lean and hard, it is the war on poverty.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, who is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am honored to have joined with my distinguished senior colleague in the preparation and presentation of this amendment. He and I share a feeling, which I am sure all other members of the Senate share, that, most of all, we intend that this program get results and that it help the poor and that we cut down in every way possible unnecessary overhead and administrative expenses so that good results and action for the poor can be obtained.

Therefore I commend my senior colleague for the work he has put into this amendment and for his offering it today. I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his help. I feel we can certainly justify efforts to try to abolish poverty if we are watchful and careful in keeping administrative expenses and costs to the very minimum. Dollars spent on duplication of effort, wasted personnel, and other sources that unnecessarily consume dollars, ought to go to help to eliminate poverty. We can ill-afford to spend too much for the employment of high officials at high salaries.

I thank my distinguished colleague for his cosponsorship.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, it puts a limit of 15 percent on all administrative expenses of community action agencies; is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. Except that the Director may waive the limitations prescribed by this paragraph for specific periods of time not to exceed 6 months, whenever he determines such a waiver is necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this title.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that the Senator from Oklahoma has discussed this matter with Mr. Shriver, the Director of OEO.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have discussed it with him. I would not say that he agrees 100 percent with it. I believe he does, however.

Mr. CLARK. He at least agrees with it 99 percent, does he not?

Mr. MONRONEY. I would say so. The question we were in slight disagreement upon, and I do not recall its being definitely settled, was as to the non-Federal contributions to such costs, and whether the 15 percent would apply to them.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding, having checked with the OEO Director's office, that he has no serious objection to this amendment. I cannot say I am enthusiastic about it, but I am prepared to accept it, and I do accept it.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I say to the Senator, I was under the impression that the Director was quite enthusiastic about having some limitations written in, to give him greater authority to say no to over-ambitious community action groups that felt it was necessary to establish a very high overhead.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I say again that generally speaking, I am opposed to writing what ought to be administrative regulations into legislation; but since the Director of the OEO has indicated that he sees no particular objection to this amendment, and since the Senator from Oklahoma feels so strongly about it, and is a very difficult Senator to oppose, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator reserve 1 minute, and yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reserve 1 minute of my time, and yield it to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], be listed as one of the sponsors of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I have been pleased to note the provisions regarding older Americans in the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. Those who developed this bill deserve much credit for the imaginative approach of their bill to the problems

and opportunities of our older compatriots.

One provision greatly strengthens section 610 of the Economic Opportunity Act, which since 1965 has declared the intention of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be considered in the development, conduct and administration of programs under the act. It would spell out in more detail the obligations of the Office of Economic Opportunity to carry out a plan for the participation of the elderly poor in war on poverty programs and to help the elderly poor to achieve self-sufficiency. Further, it would require the Director to include in his annual report a description of the ways in which this mandate has been implemented.

A provision which is not limited in its effect to the elderly but which would be especially helpful to elderly public assistance recipients is the proposed revision of title VII on "Treatment of Income for Certain Public Assistance Purposes." Heretofore, title VII has required that of the income received by a participant in Economic Opportunity programs, the first \$85 per month of such amounts plus one-half of the excess over \$85 must be disregarded in computing his public assistance benefit. The proposed treatment of Economic Opportunity income is designed to encourage the public assistance recipient to bring himself up to a minimum standard of economic adequacy instead of penalizing his efforts to do so. Furthermore, the participant's public assistance would not be reduced if the sum of his income from all sources, including public assistance, is insufficient to bring him out of poverty. This proposal would stimulate America's older public assistance recipients to take maximum advantage of the Economic Opportunity Act to launch themselves out of poverty and dependence.

The bill proposes a comprehensive revision of the title on Volunteers in Service to America, known as VISTA. As part of the revision, language is included to state a stronger congressional intention that the fullest participation of older persons as volunteers be encouraged. This is in accord with my efforts and those of the Special Committee on Aging to make available to older Americans opportunities to continue to be active and useful. We are convinced that this would benefit both the older individuals who serve and their communities, which have myriad needs for services they could perform.

Another provision to benefit the elderly is section 126 of the bill. It is an amendment to part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, which part relates to the provision of useful work and training opportunities for youths and adults. Section 126 makes it clear that part B is to help relieve long-term unemployment among persons 55 years of age and older as well as unemployment among other age groups.

Employment of the elderly would also be encouraged by a provision requiring that the Director of OEO "encourage the employment of persons 55 years and older as regular, part-time and short-term staff" in OEO programs.

Finally, the bill would make Project Find a national emphasis program. Project Find is a program administered by OEO to identify the needs and problems of the elderly poor, to refer them to existing health, welfare, employment, housing, legal aid, recreation and other needed services, and to provide some of the elderly poor with employment and volunteer opportunities. Making this program a national emphasis program would express strong congressional support for it and would encourage OEO to lend additional emphasis to it.

I am confident, Mr. President, that I reflect the sentiments of the Senators on the Committee on Aging in expressing appreciation for the emphasis upon the needs of the elderly poor which has been given by the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators who have developed this bill. These provisions to assist our older compatriots deserve the support of all Senators, and I hope they can become law.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I know of no better way of helping disadvantaged people to become self-sustaining and stabilizing elements in our society than by making it possible for them to become proprietors of their own small businesses.

Under section IV of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Small Business Administration has the responsibility of providing loans and management training to help these people become business owners and thus acquire a stake in society.

This program of assistance is now available to disadvantaged people in every State of the Union. Under the able direction of Administrator Robert C. Moot, the SBA is actively seeking to extend the program in areas that are sometimes difficult to reach.

It was with great pleasure, therefore, that I read in the September issue of South Carolina Education News, an announcement by Arthur J. Glick, SBA Regional Director in Columbia, that low-income and disadvantaged persons in South Carolina are eligible for these long-term loans.

I was particularly impressed by SBA's statement that it will go into the poor sections of cities and into depressed rural areas actively seeking business owners, or potential business owners, who can benefit from this program.

To carry this work forward, SBA's office in Columbia is cooperating with educational associations and other groups in South Carolina to reach the people who can be helped by this program.

I congratulate the SBA and the editor of Education News for their cooperation and request unanimous consent that the article be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

SMALL BUSINESS LOAN PROGRAM AVAILABLE IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The Small Business Administration's Economic Opportunity Loan Program is now available throughout South Carolina, it was announced by Arthur J. Glick, SBA Regional Director.

Applications for loans will be accepted to existing and new businesses by SBA's Regional Office at 1801 Assembly Street, Columbia, S.C., and by 72 other SBA field offices throughout the Nation.

To find those low-income and other handicapped people with the best potential to successfully operate a business, SBA will work closely with Educational Associations, Community Action groups, neighborhood centers, regional organizations and other groups throughout South Carolina, Glick said. These organizations will also be asked to assist in providing volunteers from the business community to work with SBA personnel in providing management assistance to loan recipients. In this regard, Glick said that "America has always relied upon the voluntary efforts of its community leaders to help those less fortunate and the people have always responded."

He further stated that "We do not intend to make bad loans under this program, but neither do we intend to set up inflexible road blocks. Our people are going into the poor sections of cities and into the depressed rural areas. We are looking for loans that will expand viable businesses, exploit new ideas, establish small manufacturing plants—the kinds of businesses which can have a healthy effect on the community, which can expand employment opportunities, which can stimulate the economy and be in concert with our National goals."

"In addition, SBA will make available to EOL recipients all of our management assistance tools in a combined effort to assure the success of these small businesses."

A key feature of the expanded EOL program is that it will also seek to assist for the first time those who are above the poverty level, and yet cannot qualify for SBA's regular business loan program.

Glick said that "One of the basic problems in any program of this type is reaching the people we are attempting to help and our educational leaders and teachers can render an additional public service in carrying this message to the grass roots of our communities."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, since no amendment is pending, and the proponent of an amendment has not arrived in the Senate Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] may be recognized to speak on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT PRACTICES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 19, 1967, I delivered an initial floor speech concerning questionable military procurement policies and procedures. It concerned two Army contracts. Both were awarded to big business firms although substantially lower bids were on file from small business firms. Specifically, one award was given to Northrop Nortronics—a division of Northrop Aviation—the high bidder, over Custom Packaging Co., the low bidder. The other award was given to Radio Corp. of America, the high bidder over Decitron Electronics Corp., the low bidder.

The first contract involved a shoulder-borne portable flame weapon. The other contract involved a portable walkie-talkie radio set. In both transactions the procedures used to justify the excessive cost to the taxpayers seemed to me to be so highly questionable that I urged that Congress proceed with a thorough investigation of our military procurement policies.

The case involving my constituent, Custom Packaging Co., Aurora, Colo., clearly pointed out a serious shortcoming

in our ability to properly review transactions involving millions upon millions of the taxpayers' dollars. Congress has depended upon the Comptroller General of the United States to accomplish the technical aspects of this review. The Comptroller General has acknowledged that this is not being done.

In response to the protest filed by my constituent, the Comptroller General responded in part as follows:

Your claim of improper use by the procuring activity of proprietary information contained in Custom's unsolicited proposal is categorically denied by responsible and knowledgeable technical personnel of the Department of the Army. And while your rebuttal and other correspondence dealing with this allegation strongly disputes the conclusion reached by the Army Technical Personnel, we have no alternative but to accept the facts as reported by the Army. In actual disputes, such as here, which are technically beyond the competence of our office because of the scientific or engineering concepts involved, we must accord a significant degree of finality to the Administrative position.

In other words, Mr. President, the Comptroller General is saying that no review was made of the charge beyond asking the Army whether it disagreed with the assertion made by my constituent. Of course, the Army responded in the manner it did in order to protect those responsible for this questionable transaction in the first place.

The Small Business Administration also questioned the Comptroller General about the award of the contract to Nortronics at more than twice the amount bid by Custom Packaging Co. In his response to the Small Business Administration, the Comptroller General hedged the question posed by the Small Business Administrator that, under the Small Business Act, provision is made that where a small business concern is certified by SBA to be a competent Government contractor with respect to capacity and credit, the procuring officers of the Government must accept such certification as conclusive. After having admitted in his letter to my constituent that in actual fact no review was made, the Comptroller General goes on to say:

On the basis of the record before us, we are of the view that Custom's proposal was technically non-responsive to the Army's requirements as detailed in the statement of work accompanying the request for proposals. In reaching this view, we are aware that some of Custom's deficiency disclosed in the technical evaluation related to its capacity and credit.

And then he revealed the following:

However, Custom received only a rating of 2 on its technical approach to the government's requirements out of a possible weighted factor of 40.

This "weighted average" method of eliminating the lowest bidder struck me as being familiar. Upon checking, I find that this very same gambit was used to eliminate the low bidders on the development of a portable radio communications set which has the official nomenclature AN/PRC-62(.). The Army Electronics Command awarded a contract to the Radio Corp. of America—and here we go again with RCA. This is the third time I have brought them up—for \$1,073,150 in spite of the fact that the Army had re-

received substantially lower bids from such companies as Bendix Radio, General Motors Delco Radio Division, Raytheon, General Dynamics, Magnavox, Sylvania, and others. The lowest bid received for this AN/PRC-62 radio came from the International Telephone & Telegraph Co. We all know these are the giants of the electronics industry.

It is a well-known fact that the United States—and we can say this again after today's debate—is not a profitmaking organization. But, when we have procurement officials who can throw out low bids from firms such as I.T. & T., who are enormously well qualified to develop any kind of radio we could think of, then I think it is high time we took another look at the regulation the Army cited as justification for its actions. The Army justified these actions under section IV, part 2 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulations. Just how does this work?

The Comptroller General's report No. B-160809 explains how the Army did this in the case of my constituent, Custom Packaging Co. First, they completely ignored the price of the item to be procured. Then the Army proceeded to assign an arbitrary set of "values" to the various bids. The Army said that technical approach to the problem was to count 40 percent; technical personnel 20 percent; background experience only 15 percent; facilities 15 percent; and schedule—whatever that is—was to count 10 percent.

Having established this approach, the Army then contrived a new set of numbers having nothing whatever to do with price, and lo and behold, Nortronics got the highest rating, while Custom Packaging Co., which conceived the flame weapon, developed it at its own expense—and demonstrated it to the Army—got a rating of two points out of a possible weighted factor of 40. This, I might say, is despite the fact that SBA had certified the company's capacity and credit ahead of time.

Mr. President, the case of the AN/PRC-62 radio procurement was well documented by GAO report B-152884. There again the weighted average was used. The report shows that in awarding the contract to the Radio Corp. of America for an amount in excess of \$1 million, the Army Electronics Command ignored the following lower bids:

I.T. & T., \$421,140.

Bendix Radio, \$434,627.

Advanced Communications, \$470,445.

Electronics Communications, \$489,155.

General Motors Delco Radio Division, \$556,152.

The report contains the following incredible admission:

We could not independently evaluate the technical aspects of the proposals, nor could we determine from an engineering standpoint whether the Agency's technical evaluations were reasonable. Furthermore, many of the Agency's technical evaluations were not adequately documented. However, our review disclosed that the Agency's engineers responsible for evaluating the proposals were in general agreement that RCA's proposal was the best.

Of course, they would.

Mr. President, I think we ought to think about this for a second. Here is the Office of the Comptroller General which is designed to be at least Congress agency to determine whether the executive departments of the Government are operating in the best interests of the taxpayers and in the best interests of the country. Yet, they have said now on three consecutive occasions that they were not qualified to analyze the scientific and other material which forms the basis of the Army's decision. Consequently, the only thing they can do is accept the Army's decision, even when in the Comptroller General's report it says it is not documented, and the Army's opinion has been based on the claimed lack of technical competency of companies like International Telephone & Telegraph.

Can we conceive of any more ridiculous position than having the Army come up and try to tell the Comptroller General or anybody else that ITT or Bendix or Advanced Communications or General Motors cannot build a portable radio? It is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of.

Here we have another \$500,000—that is not a great amount in the present budget—thrown down the drain solely because the Army wants to deal with RCA to the exclusion of everybody else. I say it is amazing indeed.

I am informed today that the Army is right this minute scheduling \$8.5 million in this fiscal year into sole-source noncompetitive production for the AN/PRC-62() radio set that I have just finished talking about, where we have bids from five perfectly competent companies that are far lower than the bid from RCA. In view of what has transpired, it will come as no surprise when RCA is announced as the lucky company that is going to get this "urgent" award—much to its happy surprise.

I would not be surprised next month to learn that the Army has generated another of its classic "urgent" requirements—this time for shoulder-borne flame weapons to be produced by Nortronics on a noncompetitive basis, because the Army will say they need them in a hurry, even though they have a 2-year development program already in operation.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, has recently held hearings, during the course of which I was assured by Mr. Robert Moot, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that SBA is going to be far more vigorous in seeking corrective action in this area. We have been promised a report on the cases which I have previously reported to the Senate. I am looking forward to receiving these reports.

Mr. President, I believe that this free ride on the taxpayers' back has gone on long enough. Surely, not every research and development program has to come up devoid of manufacturing drawings, precisely in point of time to coincide with an overpowering, overriding demand for immediate delivery. Certainly, we should be capable of orderly planning that would allow open competitive bidding for our military requirements. As

it is today, less than 15 percent of all the money spent by the Pentagon—the billions of dollars that we spend—is awarded under contracts based on competitive bidding and public opening of bids. This situation exists in spite of the fact that it is common knowledge that competitive bidding reduces the cost from 30 to 50 percent under noncompetitive costs.

Mr. President, as I have said, this is the third speech I have made on this subject, and the third series of contracts I have brought up. I hope to bring up more such instances in the future, because the point I am making is that somewhere something is wrong in the Army procurement system. One result of this wrong is that tax funds are being spent at a rate far in excess of what is needed. Another result is that the low bidder, time and time again, has been knocked out as the eventual procurer of the contract, and it is given to the big companies that already seem to have a great number of defense contracts. This situation raises questions in my mind and, I believe, in the minds of all of us.

I do not wish to accuse anybody of wrongdoing. But it seems to me that the cases I have already developed are sufficient in nature and in scope to warrant a thorough-going congressional investigation into what is happening in the military procurement policies as they are being administered today under the Secretary of Defense.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 853) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, there are many and varied approaches which can be made to the training provisions under this act. There are many areas in which training can be accomplished which have not been explored to the full extent that they can be.

The national system of libraries is a case in point. It seems to me that training programs through the local library system might be a very worthwhile project.

Librarians in public, professional, and school libraries have in many cases direct lines of communication to the disadvantaged communities and the disadvantaged adults and children in those

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 56, line 3, delete the period, substitute a semicolon, and add the following: "Provided, no project under such program may grant assistance to bring any action against any public agency of the United States, any State, or any political subdivision thereof."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment to section 221(B)(3). As written, this section designates the legal services program as a national emphasis program in our Nation's battle to eliminate poverty.

In waging this war to help the poor to rise out of living conditions which offer little or no hope for the future and into a world which offers a real economic opportunity, the Office of Economic Opportunity has designed, and the Congress has approved a frontal attack on many conditions which have kept these people living in a world without a ray of light or hope. Some facets of the program are designed to be immediate cures. Other projects are designed to prepare the person to face the challenge he will encounter as he hopefully walks out of poverty's door into a brighter sunlight in the future.

Increased educational opportunities do this. So do job skill training programs and the providing of jobs. Still other programs are designed to attack community problems and personal problems if you will. The OEO has concluded that it is not enough simply to educate and train a man for a job, but, rather, it must also help him confront some of his other social problems.

To this end, the OEO has established a legal services program in order to make the law an instrument which could work for the poor as well as work against them. In the past, persons of low income have had great difficulty in receiving competent legal guidance and assistance. I know this, because at several periods in my lifetime I could very well have used the good offices of a competent lawyer, but I could not afford to hire one. Oftentimes the cost has been prohibitive. The legal services program seeks to remedy exactly this condition.

In June, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty re-

ceived testimony from Orison S. Marden, the president of the American Bar Association. In reviewing the accomplishments of the legal services program during the last 6 months of 1966, Mr. Marden told us that based on reports received from 104 legal services programs throughout the country, legal assistance had been rendered in 92,000 cases and an additional 15,000 persons received non-legal help or interviews. He also stated:

By June 30th the total clients served will have exceeded 300,000. The great bulk of these cases has been settled by advice or negotiation. Only 15 percent required action in the courts. Yet the court record is impressive: they won 75 percent of their cases and prevailed in 62 out of 71 appeals filed. In addition, more than 2 million of the Nation's poor have received education in their legal rights and obligations.

I think that is a most remarkable record.

The work they have done is good and the dedication they have exhibited is moving, indeed. But, legal services attorneys are not only working as defense council, they will also bring a cause of action as well as defend an indigent in a suit. They will do one thing more. They will institute test cases. Recently, in this manner, they have begun to challenge our laws all too often.

While there is nothing wrong with this, we must remember that the taxpayers of our great Nation are paying for the services of these attorneys and, consequently, I question the propriety and the enormous expense to the taxpayer of a legal service program bringing suit against an agency of the Federal, State, county, or local government. In such instance, the taxpayer is paying the legal fees of both the plaintiff and the defendant—which does not seem quite right to me.

It has come to my attention that last April the California rural legal assistance program began an all-out assault on the Sutter County, Calif., welfare office rounding up potential welfare recipients and taking them to the county welfare office. The director of the office, in compliance with the regulations, granted immediate payments when she considered the application "to be in immediate need." In other cases, aid was denied at the immediate moment pending evaluation of the complaint. As a result, the California rural legal assistance program has filed some 30 appeals based on the fact that some applicants were denied on-the-spot aid as well as the fact that other applicants deserved retroactive reimbursement for denied payments. Concurrent with these 30-odd appeals, the CRLA has filed a law suit against the welfare director which has occasioned the Sutter County board of supervisors to hire an attorney to defend her. This suit has now gone from the local superior court to the district court of appeals and to the State supreme court. While all courts have refused to hear the case, the taxpayers will be forced to bear the burden of the cost of both the plaintiff and the defendant.

I assure you, Mr. President, that this was not in my mind when I stated I was greatly in favor of the rural legal services program.

In another example, this same group,

the California rural legal assistance program, brought suit against the Department of Labor. Earlier this year, I alerted the Department of Labor to the forthcoming need for a minimum of 10,000 Mexican farmworkers to harvest tomatoes and other crops in the northern San Joaquin Valley of California. On September 7 Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz approved the importation of 8,100 Mexican supplemental workers after California growers and the California Department of Labor issued a formal request. The next day an attorney for the California rural legal assistance program on behalf of 26 California farmworkers filed suits in U.S. District Courts in San Jose and San Francisco seeking to enjoin temporarily the importation on the ground that the certification order by Secretary Wirtz violated procedural regulations.

Once again the taxpayers financed the legal expenses of both parties to the suit—really a ludicrous and ridiculous situation. In this case however adjudication was forestalled by an agreement between the CRLA and the Department of Labor.

Included in this agreement is a formal procedure for California worker representatives to protest the admission of foreign workers and the establishment of an independent panel of citizens to review the entire system which permits growers to use foreign workers as well as an increase in the number of compliance officers. Furthermore it is my understanding that this panel will consist of seven members three of which will be CRLA attorneys.

I further submit that this was never envisioned by the members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 12 minutes have expired.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself another 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has only 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself 3 minutes.

I cannot for 1 minute believe that this was the original intent of the legal services program. I cannot believe that affording legal advice, counsel, and representation to persons unable to afford it in order to promote justice should include the right to bring suit against a Federal, State, or local agency supported by taxpayers' money when the party is represented by another agency or program which is financed by the same funds.

Although I will not dwell on this subject, I cannot believe that in either case the welfare recipient or the farmworkers went to the CRLA for assistance. It is far more likely that the CRLA drummed up clients to come and do battle. This is the problem of Mr. Shriver and Mr. Earl Johnson, the Director of the legal services program, to determine whether the attorneys employed by this program are working and conducting themselves in a proper manner.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will consider this amendment which will prohibit legal service lawyers from bringing suit against any Federal, State, county, or local agency. This program is not designed to be a

demonstration project or a "trial and error" program. We are funding it presently in the amount of \$47 million, and we should not treat its implementation lightly. The program was designed to aid the poor in achieving the legal rights and privileges which the rich can afford. It was designed to make them equal to the average citizen in the courts of our Nation. And I cannot believe that the average citizen goes to court with a test case which is of a spurious nature. He does not have the money to do so and he certainly does not have the money to give it to the poor person to use in such a questionable fashion. The disadvantaged should be helped, but we must remember the burden which is being placed on the taxpayer in providing benefits under this program. There are too many cases for legal service attorneys to handle without involving themselves in these test cases.

Therefore, I urge the acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this amendment, which would prohibit the spending of any money for legal services to support any action against any Federal, State, or local agency would, in effect, repeal the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States if a poor person is involved. In effect, this amendment says that if such a person is having trouble with his welfare payments and needs a lawyer to help him, he cannot have that help. He has to do with his own lawyer, assuming he can get one. If the chief of police picks him up on an illegal arrest, and he wants to have a lawyer to defend him, he cannot do it. If the police break into his house without a warrant, he cannot do anything about it, because that is a local agency, and he, therefore, cannot be allowed to have help from the legal services division. If any official from welfare, the chief of police, the building inspector, or anyone else violates his constitutional rights, the legal services section of the OEO is not allowed to receive 1 cent for defending him.

To me the issue is simple. Does the Constitution of the United States, so far as the first 10 amendments are concerned, apply only to those who can hire their own lawyers, but not to anyone who must depend, because of his economic circumstances, on a lawyer from the Legal Services Division of the OEO?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he leaves that point?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to ask the Senator, most respectfully, how has this problem been handled before in this Republic up to the institution of these services? Have the poor had to handle it themselves?

Mr. CLARK. Pretty much. In my city we have a voluntary service, badly supported by the community, barely able to handle more than 10 percent of legitimate cases.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the answer to the question of the Senator from California is "Yes." We have not only had volunteer services; we have had a voluntary defender, given very little money out of the city budget. We have had a legal services division paid for, quite inadequately, by the communities themselves. But the overwhelming majority of the people in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other cities in my State never have had adequate legal services until this program started.

By his amendment the Senator is saying that if an automobile dealer takes illegal action to take back his automobile, the poor person can take action against him; if a loan company wants to take illegal action, he can present his case; but if the chief of police engages in police brutality or other illegal action, he has no recourse.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, there is the Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. CLARK. Yes, there is the Civil Liberties Union.

I plead with the Senator not to press the amendment. It denies the poor their constitutional and legal rights, and I would have to strongly oppose it.

Mr. MURPHY. What I am trying to do is really preserve the actual rights of the poor and place the services where they are needed. I brought up a case, which was absolutely a rigged case and the case was settled out of court. The Government's representative could have won the case, but he was embarrassed to be representing the growers and farmers—

Mr. CLARK. The Senator told me about that case. I think he is quite right in that case, but what the Senator is doing is throwing the baby out with the bathwater by his amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY. I think our concern is exactly parallel. I had one of these lawyers in my office last week. He said these fellows are all over the place and they are doing this kind of representation. In the State of California the purpose of this legal assistance is not being used for the poor; it is being used by organizations for an entirely different purpose, never envisioned by me, at least.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no particular quarrel with the cases the Senator from California brought out. I am saying, the way this amendment is drafted, I think it is unconstitutional, and it certainly is going to remove from the poor most of the protections we hope to get them under the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] may have 1 minute?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; I had better not.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I

may have 30 seconds to propound a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement which was entered into as a result of the unanimous-consent request earlier today by the majority leader be printed in its usual form and that immediately after the conclusion of morning business on tomorrow the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be recognized for the consideration of his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That during the further consideration of S. 2388, a bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment (except one amendment to be offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]: *Provided*, That in the event the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him. *Provided further*, That on the amendment to be offered by Mr. WILLIAMS following the routine morning business tomorrow (October 5, 1967), which is not to exceed 15 minutes, debate shall be limited to 45 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. CLARK.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders or someone designated by them: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from California. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 279 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott	Fannin	McClellan
Bennett	Fong	Miller
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Mundt
Byrd, W. Va.	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Carlson	Hill	Pearson
Cotton	Holland	Sparkman
Curtis	Hollings	Spong
Dirksen	Hruska	Stennis
Dominick	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Eastland	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Ellender	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Aiken	Hartke	Muskie
Anderson	Hatfield	Nelson
Bartlett	Inouye	Pell
Bible	Jackson	Percy
Boggs	Javits	Prouty
Brewster	Lausche	Proxmire
Burdick	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Cannon	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Case	Mansfield	Scott
Church	McCarthy	Smathers
Clark	McGee	Smith
Dodd	McGovern	Symington
Fulbright	McIntyre	Tydings
Gore	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Griffin	Mondale	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Harris	Montoya	
Hart	Morse	

NOT VOTING—12

Baker	Hayden	Moss
Bayh	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Brooke	Kennedy, N.Y.	Russell
Cooper	Morton	Tower

So Mr. MURPHY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced that on today, October 4, 1967, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1564. An act to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION 201(1), FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Federal contributions program equipment and facilities (reporting symbol OCD-CONG(Q)2), for the quarter ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION 205, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, Department of the Army transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Federal contributions—personnel and administration (reporting symbol OCD-CONG(A)3), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

SECOND REPORT ON HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1965

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second report on activities carried out during the fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF GIFTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the duty-free entry of gifts not exceeding \$50 in retail value from members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, Washington, D.C., endorsing the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated September 25, 1967, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2501. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fernando Rafael Boudet-Esteban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2502. A bill for the relief of Ping Kan Hui, Yun Sung Tam, Shui Wong, Po Fat Cheng, Yuen Chun Cheuk, Chun Ho Cheung Wu, and Yiung Shing Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2503. A bill for the relief of Vassillos Tsibukis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2504. A bill for the relief of Dr. Martiniano L. Orta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTAÑA:

S. 2505. A bill for the relief of Gregorio De Santis; and

S. 2506. A bill for the relief of Dr. Julio Epifanio Moreira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 377 AND 378

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate referral two amendments to H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967, recently transmitted to the Senate by the House of Representatives.

The first seeks to raise the present earnings limitation under social security from the present \$1,500 per annum to \$2,400, or to put it in monthly terms, from the present \$125 per month to \$200 per month. Unfortunately, the House-reported bill only raises the earnings limitation to \$1,680 per year, or \$140 per month. This amendment would allow those people on social security to earn up to \$2,400 per year without reduction in benefits.

Mr. President, I believe it is most important that we enact a meaningful increase in the earnings limitation. Many of our older citizens, who are retired, find it well nigh impossible to live on the expected maximum benefit payment of \$189 per month. However, if allowed to earn \$200 extra per month, they could maintain an adequate living standard.

To my mind, it is paradoxical that we enact all sorts of Federal programs to help the senior citizen, yet we seem to do nothing to support any initiative on the part of these same citizens; in fact, we seem to penalize it.

These people possess many skills, skills learned over a lifetime of work. In my own State there is a shortage of skilled workers. The Rhode Island State Employment Service has had great success in placing older workers who have the needed skills. The one drawback to the success of this job placement program is the fact that the limitation on earnings and its attendant reduction on benefits puts a damper on initiative.

The second amendment calls for a cost-of-living adjustment for social security benefits, an adjustment that would rise or fall with the movement of the consumer price index.

Economists preach that this cost-of-living adjustment is, in the long run, a bad feature which would eventually work against social security. However, the long run is of no interest to those people of 65 who would have to struggle to earn a

decent living on the expected maximum of \$189 per month.

It is quite clear that living costs are constantly rising. It is manifestly unfair that those people with the least amount of money should have to wait for Congress to act every 2 or 3 years in order to live in a market of rising costs. A cost-of-living adjustment will, of its own accord, insure that social security benefits truly reflect the consumer market.

I urge the Senate Finance Committee to consider these amendments to H.R. 12080, for I feel that they will be of great aid to our senior citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments (Nos. 377 and 378) were referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT NO. 379

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, action is needed, as it has been over these years, to remove a longstanding inequity in the social security law. There is no penalty for those who in retirement receive investment income. It is possible to have \$5,000, \$10,000, or any other amount of income so long as it does not come from wages. But for many a worker, particularly those whose lives have been spent in low-paid employment resulting in no savings and investments as they struggle daily to make ends meet, there is a need, so long as health and circumstance permit, to continue working. Social security alone is insufficient to meet the need for income in retirement, yet many have no other resources. In fact, a study by the administration on aging shows that those over 65, 9 percent of the population, comprise 16 percent of all our poor. Put another way nearly a third of all retired persons fall in the poverty class.

Administration recommendations to raise the income limitation are inadequate. The limitation should be removed completely. We should make the desire to work a desire that is rewarded instead of penalized. Let us not continue to make it unprofitable for a worker to want to continue to contribute to his own and the Nation's economic betterment.

Mr. President, on May 2 of this year I introduced S. 1665, a bill to remove completely the earnings limitation on income of social security beneficiaries. Today I offer the bill in the form of an amendment to H.R. 12080, the omnibus social security bill now before the Senate Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 379) was referred to the Committee on Finance.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT, DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 380

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move

to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 10345) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 48, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

"That section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is hereby amended by adding immediately following paragraph (15), a new paragraph, as follows:

"(16) The findings of fact contained in paragraphs (1) through (15) of this section are reiterated. Recent court decisions involving the registration provisions of this Act make it necessary to enact legislation to accomplish the purposes of such Act without the requirements of registration. Disclosure of Communist organizations and of the members of Communist-action organizations as provided herein is essential to the protection of the national welfare."

"Sec. 2. Section 5 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:

"(a) By changing that part of subsection (a) thereof beginning with the first word of the subsection and continuing down to subparagraph (1) thereof, so as to read:

"(a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board determining any organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, it shall be unlawful—

"(b) By changing that part of subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) thereof which precedes (A) so as to read:

"(1) For any member of such organization, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—

"(c) By changing that part of subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) thereof precedes (A) so as to read:

"(2) For any officer or employee of the United States or of any defense facility, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—

"Sec. 3. Sections 7 and 8 of the Subversive Activities Control Act are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 4. The caption to section 9 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read: 'RECORDS OF FINAL ORDERS OF THE BOARD; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS'; and

"Section 9 of such Act is amended so as to read:

"Sec. 9. (a) The Board shall keep and maintain records, which shall be open to public inspection, giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and individuals as to whom, there are in effect final orders of the Board issued pursuant to any of the provisions of subsections (g) through (j), inclusive, of section 13, or subsection (f) of section 13A.

"(b) Copies of the reports and orders of the Board so issued shall be furnished by the Board to any person upon request and upon the payment of the reasonable costs thereof as then currently fixed by the Board.

"(c) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and all individuals as to whom, there are in effect such final orders of the Board."

"Sec. 5. Section 10 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows: the first sentence thereof preceding subparagraph (1) is amended so as to read:

"Sec. 10. (a) It shall be unlawful for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization—

"(b) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (1) thereof is amended to read: 'Disseminated by ———,

an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist- ——— organization;'

"(c) The phrase following the colon at the end of subparagraph (2) thereof is amended to read: 'The following program is sponsored by ——— an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist- ——— organization.'

"Sec. 6. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (a) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: 'there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization.'

"Sec. 7. Beginning with (j), all that of subsection (b) of section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act down to and including the end thereof is amended so as to read: 'there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action or a Communist-front organization.'

"Sec. 8. Paragraph (2) of subsection (e) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended so as to read:

"(2) upon application made by the Attorney General under section 13(a) of this title, or by any individual under section 13(b) of this title, to determine whether any individual is a member of any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining such organization to be a Communist-action organization."

"Sec. 9. Section 13 of the Subversive Activities Control Act is amended as follows:

"(a) By amending subsection (a) thereof so as to read:

"(a) (I) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such organization a petition for a determination that such organization is a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, as the case may be.

"(II) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any individual is a member of an organization which has been finally determined under this section to be a Communist-action organization, he shall file with the Board and serve upon such individual a petition for a determination that such individual is a member of such organization. Each petition under part (I) or part (II) of this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts upon which the Attorney General relies in support of his prayer for the issuance of such order."

"(b) By amending subsection (b) thereof so as to read:

"(b) Any organization as to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist organization, and any individual as to whom there is in effect a final order of the Board determining him to be a member of a Communist-action organization may, not more often than one in each calendar year, file with the Board and serve upon the Attorney General a petition for a determination that such organization no longer is a Communist organization (in the case of an organization which has been determined under subsection (a) of this section to be one of the types of Communist organizations) or that such individual no longer is a member of a Communist-action organization, as the case may be. Each petition filed under and pursuant to this subsection shall be verified under oath, and shall contain a statement of the facts relied upon in support thereof. Upon the filing of any such petition, the Board shall serve upon each party to such proceeding a notice specifying the time and place for hearing upon such petition. No such hearing shall be conducted within twenty days after the service of such notice."

towns are protected by artillery and airpower. At the same time, the local ARVN officers, whether in civilian or military posts, do not expect to challenge the Viet Cong seriously in the villages.

THE VIETCONG: THE CADRE, HIS SOCIAL ROLE AND HIS MISLEADING TACTICS

Since most violence and struggle movements occurred in the Southern Lowlands, eventually entirely under Viet Cong direction, it is vital to treat separately the basis of Viet Cong activity. This basis is a Communist political and social innovation, the local cadre, and subtle political tactics which make detection of his activity and a response by the legal government very difficult. The Viet Cong cadres are the only effective link between many Vietnamese villages and centralized commands, and they are the strongest such link in Vietnamese history.

The Viet Cong cadre is almost always an ambitious local person who has been trained to live with the people of his village, to seek out those with grievances against Saigon-appointed local officials and against local notables and to provide incidents which mobilize the peasantry against the government. Land reform, for instance, is not an abstract goal for the cadre and his followers—instead it provides patronage for political power. Landless tenants who join the cause are, given plots of absentee landlords and owners of medium-sized plots still living in the village often join the Viet Cong to protect their holdings.

In each village, the Viet Cong cadre starts a series of front organizations which eventually should include every villager. There are Liberation Fronts for farmers, for their wives, for their children, and for old villagers. At first, only a nominal membership fee is requested, but enthusiastic members recruit their neighbors and eventually social pressure forces everyone to join and to participate actively. If a village is hesitant or hostile toward the Viet Cong, the cadre mobilizes greater hostility toward the Saigon government by calling in a Viet Cong military unit from another area and provoking air strikes or artillery fire from nearby ARVN or U.S. forces.

Even in contested villages, the Viet Cong cadre is the most knowledgeable about local affairs. He deputizes children to report on who enters and leaves the village and on what newspapers are read and what radio stations are listened to. As the cadre's control increases, he announces more rules, "requests contributions" (taxes), and recruits troops, and villagers are increasingly careful to obey him.

Thorough investigation of their training and internal messages, together with lengthy interviews with cadres who have come over as individuals through the Chieu Hoi amnesty program, have shown that the Viet Cong cadres assigned below the provincial or district level are not usually ideologically motivated. Just as many Vietnamese learned to speak French as a path to power, without necessarily liking Frenchmen, so many low-level cadres seem to have learned and applied new political methods to take over their native villages without necessarily liking the Communists who trained them. Cadres from middle class backgrounds, who are better educated and perform vital skilled functions, as in propaganda and medicine, may even become inwardly hostile to the Viet Cong command because it mechanically gives preferential promotions to their lower class rivals. The cadre's chief concern is with his new social and political role, as the promoter of non-family social ties and as a new bureaucratic link between the village and the outside world, interpreting commands from the center and communicating village grievances back to it.

Two tactics are crucial to a cadre-based insurgency. The first is the use of terror, which is directed not simply at eliminating enemies

but more at manipulating the survivors. Before a man is assassinated or kidnapped, he usually receives a threatening letter listing grievances against him and warning him to change his ways. At the time of an assassination or kidnapping, a list of the offenses for which he is being punished is pinned to his clothing, or posted on a building, or read off to his frightened family and neighbors.

Until the last few years, the Viet Cong had a "Robin Hood" image, gained by killing and publicizing many obviously corrupt officials. As a result, assassinations on false charges of honest and able officials, the insurgency's worst enemies, were sometimes believed and did not provoke the local hostility toward the Viet Cong that an air-strike does against Saigon. Furthermore, not only are Viet Cong methods of violence inherently more selective than those of ARVN and U.S. forces, but the political intelligence of a Viet Cong cadre is much better than that of the typical Vietnamese or American local official on rapid rotation. Because of his better information, the Viet Cong cadre gets more political leverage from his carrots and sticks than our side does. Attacks on the most able men as well as on the most corrupt clearly indicates that Viet Cong cadres are seeking power in their villages and not simply reforms.

The second crucial tactic is that of the "coexistence" village, where the Viet Cong cadre, the village notables, the Saigon appointed district chief, and local ARVN officer "won't fight" and "live and let live," jockeying for political position without open resort to violence. Once a village's front organizations have started up a Viet Cong cadre is not supposed to provoke attacks for fear of being shown as unable to defend his people. By day, such villages are supposed to admit joint teams of American medical personnel and Saigon-trained propagandists. These villages all use Saigon government identity cards. In such villages, Viet Cong cadres would encourage participation in Saigon's elections in order to keep all identity cards in good standing, and the cadres would also oppose mutilating ballots which could be traced to their districts.

While this balance of local power is stable, neither the Viet Cong cadres nor the ARVN officers can formalize their tacit arrangement. Viet Cong cadres can get amnesty only as individuals through the Chieu Hoi program, and if a cadre were to bring over his small military force with him, it would be imprisoned for treason or placed under the district ARVN officer, outside of the control of the amnestied cadre and his village. "Coexistence" ARVN officers have enough trouble avoiding taunts that they "won't fight" without trying to suggest to Saigon that power be shared locally. In short, while the cadres and the officers can forestall disruption from their commands by reporting back that all is quiet (but not yet quiet enough to become a Viet Cong base camp or for landlords to return for their rents) and by avoiding violence which would attract attention to their area, they can do nothing constructive to promote their common interests and those of the populations they rule.

Unfortunately, the introduction of foreign troops or advisers disrupts the tacit peace and brings on violent incidents without being able to change the basic division of authority. North Vietnamese units can not capture district towns, and American forces, short of a full counter-insurgency operation, cannot capture the villages. Americans usually cannot provide a direct alternative to the Viet Cong, even if a village's cadre has become unpopular, because mistrust of a return to colonialism is stronger than dislike of the Viet Cong. Under Diem villagers south of Saigon openly referred to the government as the "My-Diem" regime the "American-Diem" regime. In one Mekong Delta village where the peasants disliked the Viet Cong a young ARVN officer began to make good impression last year and he was warned in time to leave

each time the Viet Cong assassination squad visited the village. But when an American was assigned to advise him the villagers changed their minds decided that the Viet Cong were right in opposing even good officials from Saigon because they would bring American control and allowed the next assassination squad to kill the young ARVN officer.

LINOTRON—FASTEST TYPESETTING MACHINE IN THE WORLD

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to report on an important scientific development in the world of printing.

It is an electronic typesetting system which composes words on film at speeds of more than 1,000 characters per second. It is now in use at the Government Printing Office.

Called Linotron, it is the fastest typesetting machine in the world. It is the first ever to set an entire page of type at one time. All previous methods compose type one line at a time.

Linotron uses a highly advanced television technique where the functions of 256 television cameras are applied to set pages from computer programed tapes. At its average pace of 1,000 characters per second, the system completes a book-size page every 5 seconds with no time loss between pages. It could typeset the Bible in about 77 minutes, a job which took Johannes Gutenberg nearly 5 years in the 15th century.

The system is the result of more than 4 years of joint development effort by the CBS Laboratories of Stamford, Conn., and Mergenthaler Linotype Co., a division of ELTRA Corp.

At formal ceremonies on Monday, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing, described Linotron as the most significant development in typesetting since the invention of the Linotype machine in 1886. He said:

In the effort to cope with the information explosion, a major bottleneck has been eliminated. For the first time, man is able to compose typography at computer speeds—not a line at a time, but over an entire page in any sequence of characters desired. It is an amazing machine and will save the government thousands of dollars.

Immediately following the ceremonies, the Linotron began work on a Defense Supply Agency stock catalog job of nearly 50,000 pages. Formerly reproduced from computer printout copy, the catalog, as typeset by Linotron, will save the Government an estimated \$250,000 annually.

James L. Harrison, the head of the Government Printing Office, said that up to 40 percent of the bulk of large printing jobs can be saved with the use of one Linotron system. The GPO will receive a second system later this year. He added:

The use of two Linotron systems will repay the government's \$2 million investment in less than two years.

An even more advanced version of Linotron, designed to reproduce pictures as well as type, is now being built by CBS Laboratories and Mergenthaler for the U.S. Air Force Logistics Command.

J. A. Keller, president of ELTRA Corp., said:

Linotron will have a profound effect on the future of printing and publishing. The systems now in existence and those presently being built are sophisticated and have great capacity, but development work is continuing.

Linotron is expanding into a whole family of systems involving computer typesetting, and can be tailored to individual needs in the fields of general printing, book publishing, newspapers and computer printout.

The development of the Linotron was led by Kenneth Moore, general manager of CBS Laboratories' Graphic Systems Department, according to Dr. Peter C. Goldmark, president and director of research of CBS Laboratories, who said:

The principles on which the Linotron developments are based lend themselves to fundamentally new methods of selectively retrieving and randomly recording extreme resolution alpha numeric symbols or picture material. An entirely new generation of full page character and picture typesetting systems will evolve from the first phase of our development work which resulted in the Linotron machine placed into operation today.

It is gratifying to CBS Laboratories that such diverse government projects as CBS Laboratories' Lunar Orbiter development and the Linotron shared in many of our fundamental technologies.

The heart of the radically new composing system is an electronic tube developed by CBS Laboratories, according to Mr. Moore. From a set of glass plate type character grids, letters, numerals and symbols are projected onto a light-sensitive surface of the tube.

Mr. Moore said:

The tube essentially performs the function of television cameras, each aimed at a different character.

On command from a coded computer tape, the tube releases the characters—in the form of electrons, which are amplified into video signals—and allows them to appear in any desired position and size on the screen of a unique cathode ray tube. The tube can display 180 times more detailed type and picture information than an ordinary television receiver. As the characters appear on the screen—faster than the human eye can detect—they are instantly recorded on film in front of the screen.

Although Linotron averages 1,000 characters per second for extreme high-quality reproduction, it can run as fast as 10,000 characters per second for print of typewriter quality. There are no moving parts except for advancing the film and changing the glass grids to different type styles. Each of these motions takes a fraction of a second.

Computer programming codes to operate Linotron were developed by Mergenthaler Linotype Co., prime contractor of the system. Basic copy to be printed is first punched on paper tape along with instructions for page makeup, indentation, type changes and other information. The paper tape is then converted to magnetic tape by the computer, which adds directions for spacing and hyphenating.

Mr. Harrison observed:

Almost 20 percent of the total \$1 billion Federal printing program now involves photographic reproduction of information fed out directly from computers. This is somewhat like reproducing an endless tele-

gram, with its accompanying poor quality, hard to read type and mammoth waste of paper.

Mr. Harrison emphasized:

Because it uses magnetic tape, Linotron will free computers to do other jobs. A computer can put information on tape many times faster than it can print the same information on paper.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished acting majority leader, to fully confirm my understanding, that the Senate will convene at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in response to the query from the distinguished minority leader, there will be no more votes tonight.

The Williams amendment will be made the pending amendment tonight before we adjourn. We will adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning under the previous agreement. There will be no more than 15 minutes for morning business, after which the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Williams amendment and, under the previous agreement, up to 45 minutes will be allowed for the Williams amendment.

So it is anticipated that there will be a vote by 10:30 tomorrow morning on the Williams amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have one further inquiry. As I understand it, when action is completed on the pending bill, the next order of business will be the so-called transportation appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, that is also my understanding. There are four appropriation bills on the callendar, and it is my understanding, after talking with the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, that the first of those appropriation bills to be considered by the Senate will be the transportation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand also that after we complete the consideration of that bill, we will consider the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct. And then perhaps NASA and finally public works.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But not necessarily in that order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Not necessarily in that order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill will follow the Transportation appropriation bill?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I referred to it as the second in a series, but I then stated that these would not necessarily follow in that order. The transportation appropriation bill will be first.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope that bill will not come up before next Tuesday. I hope that can be arranged satisfactorily.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The leadership will be glad to cooperate as far as possible, I am sure.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 381

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, reads as follows:

On page 2, beginning with line 3, strike out everything through line 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "sum of '\$2,060,000,000 of which, subject to the provisions of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$295,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of part A of title I of such Act, \$579,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title I, \$1,022,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title II, \$20,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III, \$27,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title III, \$70,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title V, \$16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and \$31,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and".

On page 26, strike out lines 10 and 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 102. Parts B and D of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 are consolidated as a new part of such title and amended to read as follows:".

On page 37, in line 19, strike out "and part D of this title".

Beginning with line 17 on page 40, strike out everything through line 12 on page 45.

Beginning with line 8 on page 78, strike out everything through line 21 on page 86.

Redesignate sections 104 through 106 as sections 103 through 105, respectively, and redesignate sections 109 through 113 as sections 106 through 110, respectively.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds so that I may yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask whether it is expected that there will be a final vote on the poverty program tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am very sanguine that we can have third reading and passage of the bill reasonably early tomorrow. Of course, I would have to tell

my friend the Senator from New Jersey that doubtful things are very uncertain. It is possible that the bill will go over. However, I am pretty confident that we can finish the bill tomorrow, and that there will be votes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I can now answer the question of a distinguished citizen of New Jersey who just called me, Elston Howard, who catches for the Boston Red Sox. He has offered me two tickets for the game. I will call him back and tell him I will have to be here.

Mr. CLARK. I am sorry. Perhaps the Senator can make it for the third game.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes without taking time from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE F-111 AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during recent months, Congress and the American public have received much information regarding serious problems which continue to plague the F-111 aircraft program. There have been many news articles and broadcasts about the TFX, as it was originally called. They have been extremely interesting and quite enlightening to Members of Congress and to many millions of citizens who are concerned with our national defense capability. A number of these accounts have been printed in the RECORD at my request.

Another excellent article, entitled "The Critics Paint an Airplane Lemon," by Ralph K. Bennett, appeared in the October 2, 1967, issue of the National Observer. I wish to commend the author for having placed the troubles of this F-111 biservice aircraft in proper perspective for discerning and interested readers.

We recall that it was almost 5 years ago that research and development for this airplane was initiated. It is now conceded that the Navy version, the F-111B, is more than 2½ years behind schedule. We all know that the total costs of the original TFX aircraft, as estimated in 1962, have now more than doubled. The cost of approximately 1,300 of these planes which we now propose to buy has spiraled to more than double the estimated cost of the more than 1,700 we originally intended to procure. It also is well known that Pentagon officials have admitted in congressional hearings that both the Navy and Air Force versions of the plane are seriously deficient in specified combat mission performance.

In his article, Mr. Bennett indicates that a primary cause for the multiple problems of the F-111 is found in the insistence of the Secretary of Defense that the dubious goal of "commonality" between both versions take precedence over the vital objective of attaining weaponry effectiveness. When an airplane's costs escalate and when its performance is sacrificed to maintain an unrealistic concept like commonality, the heralded theory of "cost effectiveness" produces, as it has in this instance, an aircraft

which military officials in the Pentagon now privately refer to as a "clunker."

Mr. President, I am not implying that commonality cannot be a valid and economical concept. Money can certainly be saved by ordering the procurement of a common weapon when the requirements of the individual services are identical. There is no way, however, to build with identical parts an effective single weapons system which will carry out separate and widely diverse military missions. Mr. Bennett's article points out that the TFX program was an attempt to combine the drastically different design and performance characteristics of a Navy plane weighing 50,000 pounds and an Air Force plane weighing 90,000 pounds. The result is an 80,000-pound hybrid craft that cannot capably perform to the requirements of either service.

The original insistence upon commonality, by amateurs in the Pentagon, despite the warnings of expert engineers and technicians that in this case the concept was neither valid nor feasible, is one of the glaring and most critical mistakes made in the F-111 program. The stubborn refusal of top Pentagon officials to admit the basic error of applying the commonality concept to this program has compounded and intensified the F-111's fundamental problems in almost 5 years of research and development and caused the costs to soar while the weaponry effectiveness has alarmingly sagged. It is now crystal clear that a complete redesign of the airplane in both its versions would be necessary to produce two individual weapons systems that would meet the separate needs of the services and the initial operational requirements specified by the Navy and the Air Force.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bennett's article in the National Observer be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Observer, Oct. 2, 1967]
AFTERBURN FOR MR. McNAMARA: THE CRITICS PAINT AN AIRPLANE LEMON

(By Ralph K. Bennett)

"... If the military really must fly, why can't it buy one machine and take turns using it?"—President CALVIN COOLIDGE.

F-111 born TFX out of Robert Strange McNamara. On paper it is the most sophisticated, flexible, yet economic air-weapon system yet devised—a single airplane capable of performing the divergent missions of both Navy and Air Force. In reality it may be the most costly bungle in the not-too-tidy history of American military procurement—a multibillion-dollar farrago, which may not only place an imposition on the taxpayer but may also compromise national defense.

What to do about it? Men of good will are torn by indecision. On the one hand they listen as starchy U.S. Sen. John McClellan, Arkansas Democrat, says the plans ought to be scrapped now, while there's time. On the other hand, they listen to Mr. McNamara's continuing insistence that the plane can meet all the requirements for which it was built, and maybe more.

The F-111 is the most controversial weapons system ever built, and last week the controversy showed no signs of slackening off. The Defense Department says the sleek, "swing wing" jet represents a bundle of technological firsts. Critics argue that it has established some other "firsts."

They believe the F-111 represents the first instance of a multibillion-dollar defense project being undertaken *entirely* on the basis of rough figures, never set down for accounting, but merely stashed away "in his head" by the Secretary of Defense.

They believe the F-111 is the first major air-weapon system, *already scheduled for complete integration into national defense*, that has reached its fifth year of development without meeting the standards originally set for it, and without operating with complete reliability.

They believe the F-111 represents the first time that a highly qualified military selection board has been overruled on its selection of an aircraft by the Secretary of Defense. In this particular instance, the board was given no opportunity to explain why it preferred an alternate design to the F-111 through four reviews of the project.

They believe the F-111 is the first major U.S. military aircraft to have doubled and perhaps tripled in cost before ever becoming operational. Expected to average about \$3,000,000 per plane at the outset of the program, the F-111 now bears a price tag of about \$6,000,000 for the Air Force version, \$8,000,000 for the Navy version.

THE SWINGING WING

General Dynamics, of Fort Worth, which won out over the Boeing Co. for the contract to build the F-111, is now working feverishly to make the plane a semblance of what it was originally intended to be. Theoretically, the secret of the F-111's "success" is its variable sweep wing. With the wing extended at right angles to the fuselage, the plane should have the capability of taking off and landing at very low speeds over a very short distance. If it sweeps its wing back 60 degrees, the F-111 should be able to fly at Mach 2.5 (about 1,650 m.p.h.) at very high altitudes. With wings swept entirely back, the plane takes on the appearance of a delta-wing jet, and should be able to streak along at supersonic speeds at tree-top level, thus avoiding enemy radar.

This amazing versatility, envisioned back in 1962, was to be the one-plane answer to the differing needs of the Air Force and the Navy. At that time, the Air Force wanted a heavy (between 80,000 and 90,000 pounds), slim, sleek, and strong fighter-bomber able to defend itself and able to make sustained supersonic "dashes" beneath enemy radar. The Air Force was already undertaking preliminary study of such a plane.

The Navy, meanwhile, was seeking a successor to its highly successful McDonnell F-4 fighter. The Navy wanted a plane with the capability of protecting the fleet from aerial attack at a great distance from the fleet itself. It had to be light (no more than 50,000 pounds) and short (for aircraft carrier stowage); and stubby, (to permit pilot and copilot to sit side-by-side). The plane must of course be capable of short take-off and landing, must have a long range, and must be able to "loiter" for great lengths of time, watching for approaching enemy aircraft. It would defend the fleet by firing sophisticated Phoenix missiles, computerized to select and destroy the most dangerous of incoming targets.

Both services were playing with the idea of a swing-wing aircraft for their needs when President John F. Kennedy came into office and Mr. McNamara went to the Pentagon. Mr. McNamara's zeal in cutting out unnecessary duplication between the services is already legend. When he saw that the Air Force and the Navy were planning to develop two swing-wing planes, he reasoned that if they both were to build and buy the same swing-wing aircraft there would be a tremendous saving in research and development and production costs.

This new plane, in short, would be the synthesis of Mr. McNamara's gospel of "commonality." It is in many ways a sound gospel,

preaching as it does that the various military services can save a lot of money by using the same basic items wherever possible, from belt buckles to boots, to butcher's smocks. But now commonality was to be carried into the realm of a sophisticated weapons system. There the trouble began. Mr. McNamara saw little difference in the mission requirements of the Navy and the Air Force. He ordered joint development "of a single aircraft of genuine tactical utility to both services" in a now famous memorandum of Sept. 1, 1961. The Navy and the Air Force grumbled, but a joint Source Selection Board was formed to establish criteria and select the best design offered by contractors.

TOO MUCH COMPROMISING

The problem of commonality pervaded work on the plane, then designated TFX for Tactical Fighter Experimental. Neither the Navy nor the Air Force felt a truly superior weapons system was possible. There was simply too much compromising. "... The incompatibility of requirements led the Navy to say that the things that made the Air Force plane better, made the Navy airplane worse," said George Spangenberg, evaluation director of the Bureau of Naval Weapons. He and other officials said commonality would present great difficulty for any manufacturer.

The two services finally did achieve compromises on performance, weight, and various aircraft characteristics. The two companies offering the best designs to meet the joint service terms were General Dynamics and the Boeing Co. Both offered swing-wing planes of very similar configuration, although the Boeing design had large air scoops above and behind the cockpit, which made it easily recognizable. Neither designer could meet the requirements of the services. Four times they reworked their designs and presented them to the Source Selection Board. *Through all four go-rounds the members of the board preferred the Boeing design.* It had longer range, greater fire power, could carry a greater selection of weapons, used thrust reversers instead of air brakes, and it was about 2,000 pounds lighter. The high-mounted air scoops meant there was less chance of damage to jet engines from foreign objects sucked in from the ground. They also minimized the possibility of exhaust from a fired missile blasting into the engine, cutting off its air supply, and thereby conking it out. They felt that Boeing management expertise, and the fact that the Boeing plane was lighter, would make its plane more economical.

The Source Selection Board made its recommendation to the Air Force Council, consisting of nine generals and (because of the joint effort) three admirals. On Nov. 8, 1962, the Air Force Council met. Its chairman, Air Force Gen. William F. McKee, recalled that "because of the clear operational superiority of the Boeing aircraft and other factors, the Air Force Council, with Navy members, voted unanimously to recommend Boeing as a source..." for the new aircraft. The council said the Boeing design advantage over General Dynamics was "clear and substantial."

Secretary McNamara turned down the decision and chose General Dynamics. In a memorandum of Nov. 21, 1962, he criticized the "excessive optimism" of Boeing reflected in its design, and ordered acceptance of General Dynamics' proposal "on the basis that it proposes the greater degree of commonness, contemplates the use of conventional materials [Boeing had urged use of titanium], provides the higher confidence in structural design, and offers the better possibility of obtaining the aircraft desired on schedule and within the dollars programed."

The Source Selection Board and the Air Force Council were never called for consultation, given an opportunity to explain, or to hear explanations. They were merely

informed of the decision. Albert W. Blackburn, an aerospace consultant in the Pentagon at the time, later observed that "it is difficult to imagine that several hundred top technical experts... would again with such seriousness of purpose and over such a long period of time... so enthusiastically seek to accomplish the choice of the superior weapon-system proposal in another such competition when the total effort expended by them is from their point of view completely negated by an executive decision."

M'NAMARA STANDS FIRM

This executive decision by Mr. McNamara is the pivot point of the entire F-111 controversy. If it negated all that went before, it also places full responsibility for what comes after upon Mr. McNamara's shoulders. The Secretary of Defense has gladly accepted this burden, and has stood by it unflinchingly to this day, through a storm of criticism and a continuing investigation by the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Senator McClellan.

Mr. McNamara's reputation as the great steel-trap brain of the Pentagon, the decision maker who brought economy and efficiency to the Defense Department, was put on the line with the F-111 decision. Was it a bankrupt decision? A costly mistake? The people who will answer "yes" to those questions are legion. But remembering the animosity that has developed between the civilian element in the Pentagon, represented by Mr. McNamara, and the military most of the brickbats thrown the Secretary's way must be examined judiciously, taken sparingly. However, there are undeniable facts arising from the inception of the TFX program, and the subsequent development of the F-111, which today place Mr. McNamara's decision in dubious light.

First, the cost. Since 1962, Mr. McNamara and his aides have trumpeted the "fact" that building of the joint-service airplane would save the taxpayers \$1 billion. A year later, the Senate investigators discovered that the \$1 billion figure was computed by a consultant in the Pentagon on a hypothetical airplane with "no relationship to General Dynamics or Boeing, or any of the other four earlier contractors." But the \$1 billion figure has become an amusing antique anyway, because of the ballooning cost of the F-111 program.

ESTIMATES GO UP

Back in 1963, the Air Force looked forward to spending \$711,000,000 on research and development of the F-111, with this included in a total cost of just under \$6 billion for purchase of 1,700 of the planes. Now the Air Force has revised its estimates. Misgivings about the plane have caused the total purchase to be reduced to 1,300 planes. However, research and development costs are now topping out at \$2 billion, with at least \$10 billion to be spent on actual plane purchases.

How could there be so much miscalculation on this revolutionary move to bring economy to military procurement? Of course the original figures upon which costs were calculated would be of great help in providing an answer. But there aren't any. Secretary McNamara rejected Air Force cost estimates on the TFX program as "unreliable" back in 1962. However, as the then comptroller general of the United States, Joseph Campbell, testified in 1963, Mr. McNamara had no "independent or additional cost estimates" of his own upon which to base the feasibility of the TFX program. When representatives from Mr. Campbell's office personally asked the Secretary of Defense for such figures, "he (the Secretary) stated that he had the figures in his head, indicating to us that he did not have them on paper."

Mr. McNamara's remarkable candor at this juncture must certainly be applauded, but

Mr. Campbell was appalled by the implications of what the Secretary of Defense had said. "I would expect the fullest kind of documentation in this case for two reasons," the comptroller general told the Senate investigators. "One is the enormous expenditure involved, and second, which may not seem important, but it is to me, in case I were not around to explain something, the supporting documents would be available."

The second element detracting from Mr. McNamara's decision is the evidence of the F-111 itself. The Air Force version of the plane can reach scarcely over 25,000 feet when fully loaded with bombs and fuel. This is far below the projected—and secret—ceiling for the aircraft. Its ferry range is 600 miles short of requirements, and its crucial tree-top "dash" range (the Air Force's prime requirement) is about 25 to 50 miles compared to the 200 miles needed. The speed brake—a hinged device that projects from the fuselage to increase wind resistance and slow the plane—continues to give trouble. (The Boeing design called for thrust reversers in the engines, such as are used on jet liners, to substitute for a speed brake).

Because of the effort towards "commonality," the Navy version—designated F-111B—suffers all these same ills, plus more. The most important is weight. In compromising with the Air Force, the Navy accepted a projected 55,000-pound weight for its plane. Now the Navy version weighs about 75,000 pounds when armed and fueled. This is dangerously excessive for carrier operations and leaves little leeway for the fact that military planes grow in weight by as much as 25 per cent over the years, as new armament and electronic systems are added. The Navy will have to restructure most of its carrier elevators to accommodate all this weight. Usually, when a plane is brought up to the deck of the carrier, it rises on the elevator with a tractor already attached to drag it to the catapult. Not so with the F-111B. The Navy will need extra tractors since the plane will not fit on an elevator with its tractor. So there will have to be tractors below decks and tractors above decks.

A LOT OF WIND

One of the most crucial of the Navy's military requirements has sadly eroded too. The Navy wanted a plane that could take off from a carrier at anchor with no wind. The F-111B will need a wind of 29 knots (allowing for the Navy's 10-knot safety margin) to take off. This means that the F-111B will only be able to take off when the carrier is moving, and moving into the wind. If there is a wind of, say, 20 knots the carrier will have to be moving at least at 9 knots in order for the F-111B to take off. If there is little wind the carrier will have to be moving at top speed to permit take-off of F-111Bs. And the carrier will be moving in a predictable direction, since it must move into the wind. An enemy could therefore know by wind direction which way the carrier is moving. Original requirements, if satisfied, would have provided an almost instant response capability, which the Navy will not have with the F-111B—a plane ironically designated for defense of the fleet.

ONE VERSION PROCEEDS

Other problems plaguing both planes are myriad. They have caused production and development delays that have put the Navy version of the plane behind schedule by as much as two years. It is still considered "unacceptable for service use" by the Navy. But the Pentagon has steamed ahead, letting a \$1.8 billion contract for the Air Force version (for an initial 493 planes) to General Dynamics. The Pentagon insists that while the Navy plan has had its troubles, the Air Force version is getting along fine. Senator McClellan observes, however, that "in view

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 6, 1967
For actions of Oct. 5, 1967
90th-1st; No. 159

CONTENTS

Accounting.....14	Foreign trade.....24,27,28	Pay.....15
Adjournment.....16	Forest highways.....2	Personnel.....5,15
Animal care.....29	4-H Clubs.....18	Planning-programing- budgeting.....4
Appropriations.....2	Holiday.....17	Postal rates.....15
Buildings.....26	Housing.....22	Poverty.....1,20
Committee reports.....9	Job Corps.....1	REA financing.....9
Commodity exchanges.....9	Land banks.....25	Recreation.....11
Conservation.....11,13	Lands.....13	Research.....2,29
Cooperatives.....12	Legislative program.....15	Rural areas.....1
Electrification.....9,19	Loans.....1,22	Rural loans.....1
Emergency food.....8	Marketing.....23	Taxation.....22,
Emergency planning.....3	Meat inspection.....21	Testile imports.....24
Flood insurance.....7,10	Migratory labor.....1	Wildlife.....11
Food.....8	Mink imports.....28	
Foreign aid.....6	Nomination.....3	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed poverty bill. House committee voted to "pass over" emergency food bill and called for study by USDA and HEW. Rep. Dwyer urged "speedup of accounting system reforms."

SENATE

1. POVERTY. Passed, 60-21, with amendments S. 2388, to amend and extend the Economic Opportunity Act. Rejected, 36-50, an amendment by Sen. Williams, Del., to reduce the authorization by \$198,000,000. pp. S14266-91

The bill amends numerous provisions of the Act and includes the following changes: Strengthens the coordinating powers of the Economic Opportunity Council. Requires OEO to prepare a 5-year national poverty action plan. Increases the Job Corps enrollment capacity to 45,000; makes eligibility requirements more specific; requires that an enrollee be assigned to the closest center having space; deletes the requirement that at least 40% of all male enrollees be assigned to conservation centers; liberalizes personal allowances; requires cooperation of Job Corps camps and local communities; provides for experimental projects to test new techniques; and raises the proportion of

women from 23% to 25%. Directs CEO to make special efforts to increase effectiveness of community action programs in rural areas. Provides that rural loans exclude outstanding interest as part of the debt limit, and authorizes \$20,000,000 additional for such loans. Provides more specific authorization for the program for migratory labor and other seasonal farm workers.

2. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 71-1, with amendments H. R. 11456, the Department of Transportation appropriation bill, which includes \$32,000,000 for forest highways. pp. S14299-333
H. R. 12474, the NASA appropriation bill, was made the unfinished business. p. S14336
3. NOMINATION. The Armed Services Committee reported the nomination of Price Daniel to be Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. p. S14242
4. PLANNING-PROGRAMING-BUDGETING. Sen. Proxmire claimed some PPB evaluations have been based on a discount rate on Treasury obligations that is too low. p. S14249
5. PERSONNEL. Sen. Ervin defended his bill, S. 1035, to protect Government employees from "unwarranted invasion of their privacy," and inserted editorials on this subject. pp. S14249-53
6. FOREIGN AID. Sen. McGee inserted a speech by Rep. Hamilton defending foreign aid. pp. S14259-61
7. FLOOD INSURANCE. Sen. Yarborough recommended flood insurance legislation. p. S14265

HOUSE

8. EMERGENCY FOOD. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture Committee "adopted a motion to pass over without prejudice" S. 2138, the emergency food and medical services bill, and adopted a resolution "calling for study by the Secretaries of the Departments of HEW and Agriculture, in cooperation with other Federal agencies." pp. D888-9
9. COMMITTEE REPORTS. The Agriculture Committee was given permission to file by midnight Oct. 6, reports on H. R. 12066, REA additional financing bill; and H. R. 13094, to amend the Commodity Exchange Act. p. H13024
10. FLOOD INSURANCE. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11197, amended, to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956, to provide for a national program of flood insurance. p. D889
11. WILDLIFE; RECREATION. A subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 25, amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the States, to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty. p. D889

"If the educated man is not willing to express standards, if he cannot show that he has them and applies them, what then is education for?"

Should it be correct that immaturity and lack of confidence underlie the mounting libertarian strain among us, then at the very least we shall have to face this reality—and cease trying to invest these tendencies with high nobility.

The blunt fact is that we cannot function as a society or as individuals without a "system," without law, a moral code, an encompassing set of standards, a capacity and a willingness to make judgments about people and their problems.

Flaws and roadblocks in the system deserve to be attacked. But freedom cannot exist without the shelter of a durable framework. A discerning radical, Harvard sociologist Martin Peretz, sees that. Those who want to short-circuit the system, he says, simply lack the proper patience and stomach and drive to change society for the better by truly democratic means.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED IN INSURANCE OF LOW-LYING AREAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, periodically Texas is visited by a great disaster caused by driving wind and water, such as Hurricane Carla, in 1961, and very recently, Hurricane Beulah. This problem is of common concern to other coastal States in the United States. Likewise, from time to time lowland areas in such cities as Dallas and Fort Worth, far inland from any coastal regions, are swamped by floods of major proportions.

The estimates of the losses incurred, while reaching into the millions, do not approach the true economic consequences. Aside from the loss of life and human misery, all regular activities are disrupted, productive capacity is impaired, strategic facilities cannot be used, and housing is destroyed.

We have various programs to rebuild public facilities and to make loans for the purposes of rebuilding private structures; but what about a small businessman or homeowner when he has to stand such an economic loss alone? He may be able to get a loan to rebuild, but how can he pay off two mortgages. The nature of flood damage is such that insurance companies have been unwilling to write policies that will provide relief for these victims.

I have for a number of years been engaged with other Senators in the search for a sound flood insurance program. This search led to the passage earlier this session in the Senate of S. 1986, of which I am a cosponsor. This Senate action is a tribute to the author of the bill, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

A flood insurance bill has been reported favorably by the Housing Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Houston Chronicle took this occasion on September 28 to publish an editorial supporting the quick passage of the bill. I agree with the Chronicle, because I think that the bill is necessary to make small home ownership and small business ownership secure in high-risk areas.

The editorial is to the point and the reasoning is sound. Since it is representa-

tive of the thinking of many of my constituents and of the great majority of the American people, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FLOOD INSURANCE BILL

Hurricane Beulah packed some of the strongest winds ever recorded for a hurricane. But it is the flooding in South Texas that is causing the worst damage. Unfortunately, the less serious wind damage will be covered by insurance; the water damage will not be.

Anything is insurable. The reason little if any flood insurance is sold is that the cost of premiums makes it prohibitive. Insuring against flood damage violates two basic actuarial principles:

First, high risk must be spread across a wide population base. People who live on high ground aren't interested in flood insurance. Those living in areas that may flood can't pay the exorbitant premiums necessary to cover their potential loss.

Second, in floods high loss is coupled with high frequency of loss. For successful insurance-writing, these two characteristics cannot be combined. For example, in fire insurance loss may be high but the frequency of loss is low. In auto insurance, frequency is high but claims generally are small. In floods, the loss per property holder is high and everybody gets hit at the same time.

Help for flood victims may soon arrive, however. A bill is now before Congress that would establish a federal flood insurance program. The bill, sponsored by Sen. Harrison Williams of New Jersey, passed the Senate almost unopposed on Sept. 14. A similar measure, sponsored by Rep. Wright Patman of Texas, is now before the House Banking and Currency Committee.

This plan, which is backed by the administration, would set up a flood insurance system supported both by the private insurance industry and the federal government. A \$500 million fund in the Treasury Department would be used to subsidize the premiums. It also would reimburse private companies should a catastrophic loss—like Beulah—occur which might threaten the companies with bankruptcy.

Under this plan, a number of private companies would set up an insurance pool to deal with the federal government. The insurance could then be sold at rates that would appeal to the average individual. One-family dwellings would be insured up to \$15,000, multiple units up to \$30,000, and personal property up to \$5000.

Disasters like Beulah, or Hurricane Betsy which caused \$1 billion of damage to Louisiana in 1965, vividly demonstrate the need for such insurance. This is good legislation.

THE REAL AMERICA FOUND IN DAKOTAS

Mr. MUNDT. The Dakota Twins—South and North Dakota—are indebted to a Chicago stock-brokerage firm for bringing national recognition to the fact that our area of the Union reflects what these analysts refer to as "the real America." Certainly no citizen of either Dakota would argue with that gratifying finding.

For the information of Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that the report issued by Wayne Hunter & Co. of Chicago, Ill., be printed in the RECORD.

I completely endorse this report on the two Dakotas. Whether it is to invest one's time as a tourist, his talents as a pheasant hunter in the world's best pheasant

hunting country, or as one seeking to buy a home, a farm, or a business, I suggest investing in the Dakotas—preferably, of course, in South Dakota. I give assurance that it will be a triple-A, gilt-edged, guaranteed, and most profitable investment.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Aberdeen American-News]

THE REAL AMERICA FOUND IN DAKOTAS

The South Dakota image is improving!

One of the first honorary citizenship certificates awarded by Gov. Nils Boe in connection with the Proud State program for bringing recognition to South Dakota should go to Wayne Hunter & Co., Chicago stock-brokers.

The nationally respected brokerage firm has reprinted in its widely circulated bulletin what it calls a Bank Bond Comment Letter. Under the title, "The Real America," it said:

"We have just returned from a visit with some of our banker friends in North Dakota and South Dakota. There we discovered afresh the spirit and character that made the United States great. At a time of strife in many large cities, unease in Washington and crisis in the sense of natural purpose, an atmosphere of self-fulfillment and resolute determination is evident at every turn in the road in the 'Dakota Territory'. These are people whose forebears, like themselves, sought opportunity rather than privilege. This is big country, whose settlers needed abundant ambition and energy.

"The rewards of successful enterprise are mirrored in the large farms that dot the countryside with their well-kept buildings and many acres of carefully-tended crops. Even old-timers whose memories go back to the 1890's can recall few better years than 1967 for small grain crops.

"Grass is thick and hay, in bales and stacks, is everywhere. Cattle, with calves by their sides, are fat and sleek. There are problems. Canada's drought has slipped over the border and damaged the corn crop in some areas. Farmers again find grain prices hitting lows even as costs of operating a farm continue to spiral. Concern is sometimes expressed about conditions among the Indian population.

"Yet, problems are viewed more as challenges than as reasons for complaint. Difficulties are not unheard of in this country. The early pioneer families underwent severe trials. A wave of bank failures occurred in the 1920s. Few Americans have ever withstood such hardships as the great drought and duststorms of the 1930s which struck just as depression gripped the nation. These Dakotans who stayed and fought back were rewarded when the scales of nature were brought back into balance. Today, to the visitor on a brief sojourn, there is an inescapable overall impression of peace and plenty, health and happiness.

"Driving down the long and narrow road toward the endless horizon, the visitor to the Dakotas can only conclude—here is a measure of the real America, here is the spirit representative of so much of the nation that is not reported on the front page. Here is reason enough not to harbor fear for our free society, but instead to look upward in hope for the future security of the United States."

PRIVATE INDUSTRY AIDS TEXAS DISASTER VICTIMS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Friday, September 29, I received a telegram from Mr. Thomas M. Rauch, president of Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

This was, indeed, a welcome message since in it Mr. Rauch informed me that he had made arrangements through drug channels to replace at no cost all uninsured stocks of medical products produced by Smith Kline & French which had been damaged or destroyed by hurricane Beulah or its aftermath. This is an excellent example of how private industry can accept a responsible social role in times of great disaster.

I thank Mr. Rauch for his action, and I invite the attention of the Senate to the telegram. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 29, 1967.

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senator,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Smith Kline & French Laboratories expresses deep sympathy for the citizens of Texas whose lives have been disrupted by the recent floods. My company stands ready to help as best it can the difficult process of return to normal conditions. We have made arrangements through drug trade channels to replace at no cost all uninsured stock of medicinal products produced by SK&F and our subsidiary, Menley & James, which have been damaged or destroyed. Please accept for the people of Texas our hope for an early and complete recovery.

THOMAS M. RAUCH,
President, Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the purpose of the pending amendment is to reduce the authorization as provided in the pending bill from \$2,258,000,000 to \$2,060,000,000. This is a reduction of \$198 million.

The adoption of the pending amendment would still give this agency every dollar that was requested in the budget. It would give them every dollar that the agency itself said it could properly spend. Certainly, at a time when we are operating with a deficit that is approaching \$2 billion a month and is estimated sometimes to be as high as \$28 billion to \$30 billion for the next fiscal year the very least we can do is to hold the appropriations not to exceed the amount which the agency itself says it can properly spend.

Personally, I think we shall have to go even further before this is over and reduce the budget estimate.

Nevertheless, this is an opportunity for the Senate to go on record as to whether it wants to live up to its promise to reduce the expenditures or whether it wants, by rejecting the pending amendment, to provide more money than the Budget Bureau says the agency can properly and efficiently spend.

I urge the adoption of the pending amendment and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. If the pending amendment is agreed to, to what extent would it curtail the job training program?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not curtail it at all as it has been recommended by the budget or by the agency itself. Job training is covered in title I, parts (B) and (D). Two titles are covered under this amendment: Part (A), title I, provides \$295 million, and the amendment would allow \$295 million. Under part (B) of title I, the Senate bill provides \$567 million. The pending amendment provides \$579 million, or an increase of \$12 million.

The pending amendment would provide for that increase on this item. It does eliminate \$105 million which the Senate bill would put in part (D), title II.

Mr. COTTON. In other words, the impact of the pending amendment on the job training aspect would be comparatively minor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. It would give to the agency every dollar which the Budget Bureau says can efficiently be spent during 1968.

Mr. COTTON. Undoubtedly the Senator is aware that the other body has just overwhelmingly rejected the conference report on the HEW appropriations bill

which, incidentally, would provide for more money for the established, tried, and tested job training activities and programs that have been long established. That indicates that if we exceed the amount recommended in the President's budget with respect to the pending bill the other body is likely to reject the amount by which we exceed the President's budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Last year the total appropriation was only \$1,750,000,000. We might also jeopardize the enactment of the proposal itself by approving this further increase of \$200 million. This is not the only job training program. In a bill pending before the Finance Committee the HEW has a substantial amount included for job training.

With the adoption of the pending amendment they will still have every dollar that they can efficiently spend. Certainly that is the objective.

Last year the total authorization for this agency was \$1,750,000,000. Budget requests for this year are for \$2,060,000,000. This is an increase of about 17 percent over last year. The Senate bill proposes to add another \$198 million, or 10 percent more than the administration requests. The pending amendment will cancel this Senate increase.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I am sure that, quite inadvertently, he did not state the position of the agency request.

The Senate bill has recommended for this agency almost \$250 million more than the committee has put into the bill. It was the Bureau of the Budget, and not the agency, which made the cut resulting in \$2.06 billion.

Let me say very candidly that, so far as the other body is concerned, I am well aware of the attitudes over there. And, quite frankly, I want some wiggle room in conference. And, if for no other reason than that, I would urge my Republican friends to give us that wiggle room. We are going to have a tough time in conference and we need some flexibility.

With respect to each of these increases, let me point to where they came from.

The first is a \$10 million increase in the training program in title I. That is a Republican amendment. It was put in the bill at the request of the minority members in order to give incentive to private enterprise to train and employ the hard-core unemployed.

We asked for \$925 million for that purpose yesterday and were turned down on a close vote. There is only \$10 million in there at the request of the Republicans. I hope the Republicans will not make us take it out.

With respect to the special impact program, which is the joint brainchild of the junior Senator from New York [Mr.

KENNEDY] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], that matter will be discussed in a few minutes by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. We put \$83 million into that in excess of the entirely inadequate \$22 million which the Bureau of the Budget had allowed us.

If that is not entirely a Republican program, the Republicans must take at least half the credit for the authorship or parenthood, as the case may be.

With respect to the \$40 million added to the community action program, \$10 million of that is for health aid; \$15 million is for aid to the elderly who have generally been shortchanged in this program; and \$15 million is for family planning.

If there is any way to curtail the number of young Americans who are going into poverty if nothing is to be done about it, I would suggest that family planning is perhaps the best. The agency reported that for every dollar spent on family planning they got a higher return than for any other project in the anti-poverty spectrum. The next item was for the migrant program and involved \$3 million. That is a joint project of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] and me.

I am happy to accept the junior parenthood of what the Senator from California so badly wanted for the migrants in California and elsewhere.

The next item is \$25 million for small business loans in poverty areas. That was the brainchild of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], a Republican addition.

Title V had an additional sum put in, \$35 million, at the specific request of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. That is a Republican addition.

The final addition, \$2 million, means we will add \$2 million to the VISTA program which, with all deference to my friend, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], has been a conspicuous success in practically every State of the Union.

That \$2 million provision has 16 co-sponsors in an effort to add this amount to the VISTA program, a great many of whom are Republicans.

So, that is where the \$198 million in excess of the budget comes from.

I hope very much that the Senate will reject the Williams amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the distinguished floor manager of the bill, and tell him that I will be brief.

The amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will strike \$198 million from the bill, and will do so in the manner just outlined by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I was the author of an amendment, accepted by the committee, which is responsible for \$40 million of the funds the amendment would cut from the bill, and I would like to explain the rationale for my amendment.

OEO's effort in programs for the elderly poor has been distressingly small,

as ample testimony in the hearings confirms. Consequently, I proposed a new, national emphasis program—Project Find—to enlarge OEO's effort, and it was accepted.

Similarly, I proposed a program designed to bring new people into, and to enhance knowledge of, the field of health services for the poor. Once again, ample testimony confirms the need for a program of this sort, and I refer my colleagues to a statement I made in this Chamber on October 3 for excerpts from the testimony.

One other new program—family planning—was added by the committee to title II of the bill, and this, too, was supported by testimony.

Now, the budget request for title II, already pared to the bone by the Bureau of the Budget, did not, of course, take into account these new programs. Consequently, I proposed to raise the authorization \$40 million in order to obviate the need of taking funds from other title II programs.

That is the rationale for \$40 million of the \$198 million proposed to be cut from the committee bill, and I know that the other \$158 million is equally well justified.

I urge rejection of the Williams amendment, as the programs they will affect are badly needed.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it had been my intention to support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. One reason why I had intended to support it was that I happened to serve on the Subcommittee on HEW of the Committee on Appropriations; and many of the meritorious programs in this bill are, in my opinion, duplication of or parallel to the programs in HEW. I believe the HEW people, who have worked through the years, are much more competent—or at least have the better experience—to administer the programs.

However, since yesterday, we know that the HEW programs will be severely cut. I am not interested in which of these programs is advocated by Democrats and which by Republicans. I do not wish to see the job training cut, if I can help it. I believe I could only continue to support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware upon one of two bases: If it were amended to give more money earmarked for the job-training program; or, two, if it were amended so that those who administer the program would be empowered to transfer funds back and forth within the program—just within this program—so that they would have the opportunity to use funds for purposes which they consider the most vital. I consider the actual job training the most vital.

Incidentally, I am not interested in giving the able Senator from Pennsylvania more "wiggle room" in conference. I believe the Senate should work its will and stand as steadfast as the other body. There has been too much "wiggling" in conferences.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, and I appreciate his position.

In the colloquy earlier with the Senator from New York—who will discuss his own position with regard to this amendment—the suggestion was made that if this amendment were adopted I should agree to go along with a second amendment which would give to the conferees the right to rearrange these figures in a manner within the confines of the bill as they thought best. I told him I would have no objection to such a proposal. I was only seeking to reduce this amount by the \$198 million, and I would be willing to confer upon the conferees the authority to rearrange this amount in a manner they believe would be best.

I call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that not only in the HEW bill which he mentioned, which is now before the House, but also in the social security bill, about which the HEW representatives are testifying before the Committee on Finance, there are included sections dealing with welfare, the Job Corps, and aid to the elderly. Under that bill the administration proposals call for a separate multimillion-dollar job training program, which will be handled either by HEW or by the Secretary of Labor.

There is no question about the fact that all these agencies are recommending an expansion of the job-training program. This is by far not the only agency dealing with this subject.

The question is what is the most efficient manner in which to handle the job training program and just how much can we afford. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that this is one of the more important items in this program and one that should be given top priority. Nevertheless, we have before us an amendment which gives to this agency all it can spend properly and efficiently.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall yield shortly—

Mr. CLARK. That is the second time the Senator has misstated the fact.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 1 additional minute. The Senator from Pennsylvania is in error. I will agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that the agency could spend more if Congress wants to be so free. I do not doubt that any agency under this Great Society could spend five times more than it gets. They are experts at spending.

Mr. CLARK. Asked for more.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are not bashful about asking. I have never seen any of these agencies that did not ask for more and spend more just as I have seen the Senator from Pennsylvania ask for more and spend more for every spending program. But to spend more we also have to tax more, and which Senator is going say, "Tax more"? It is all right to promise, but with what are you going to pay for it?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the

Senator withhold that request for 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I am disturbed because of the fact that the ax fell yesterday, and the money for job training which we expected in HEW will not be there.

Before this matter is frozen with the yeas and nays, I wish the Senator from Delaware would consider amending his motion, while he can, to allow a little more money earmarked for job training, because we are not likely to get it in the HEW bill, through we shall fight for it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from New Hampshire that it may be his suggestion has merit, but we are on limited time. We have Senators about to leave the Chamber, and we have committed ourselves to voting at the end of 45 minutes. There will be opportunity after we dispose of the Williams amendment, with a little less speed and a little more wisdom, to see what can be worked out. I do not believe that we can do it on the floor in the next 20 minutes.

Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is compelling me to vote for the Williams amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment of my colleague, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

There is logic and consistency in his position that we should oppose appropriations larger than recommended by the administration and should, in fact, reduce appropriation. I have been following this position. Only a few days ago I was one of three Senators who voted against a \$2.5 billion appropriation for military construction in the United States and all over the world because it has little relevance to the war in Vietnam and should be postponed. We will have a pay raise bill coming up shortly costing up to \$5 billion. I intend to vote to postpone pay raises, other than for the military.

The human needs of the people who have no jobs must be considered. Each Senator makes a judgment as to the relative worth of various programs. I believe there are no more pressing problems before the country than jobs for people who are out of work, for decent housing and measures to close the gap between people who are steadily advancing and those who remain behind.

I have my doubts and troubles concerning the poverty program, its waste and duplication in my State and in the country. This bill is an improvement and I hope that the programs will be improved.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment.

I congratulate Senator CLARK for his able management of that bill, and the members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Delaware if he intends to use the remainder of his time. He has more time remaining than I have.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator is ready to vote, we can terminate the debate now and vote, if he wishes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, what concerns me in connection with this amendment is not only that it would cut down on the war on poverty, but also that it would cut down on it in a number of particularly critical areas.

President Johnson made a statement just 2 days ago about the importance of the private enterprise system in dealing with poverty; he announced that about \$50 million was going to be taken from various programs to permit private enterprise to proceed on the unemployment problem.

This amendment would eliminate almost all private enterprise effort from the war on poverty.

It would cut down on it first by deleting \$10 million for special incentives to private employers to hire poor people. In committee the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] led an effort, which was supported by the Republican members of the committee, to get the private sector more actively involved. Although the proposal was offered by the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], it was supported by all members of the committee. This resulted in a \$10 million incentive to private enterprise to actively go out and hire people; it seeks to bring the private sector in in a major way and to assist in an ongoing program.

Second, the special impact program added to the law last year is based on inducing private enterprise to locate in the ghetto, working with Government, and yet giving incentive to the private sector to hire people who are unemployed. This program has worked well, as Secretary Wirtz and Mr. Shriver told the committee at our hearings.

So there is a major effort at the present moment to bring in the private sector. And so, Mr. President, it does not seem to make sense to agree to this proposal. It would also cut all funds to aid the development of small business in the ghetto. Again, this would eliminate money in an area where the private sector of our economy was to be involved in fighting poverty.

The proposal of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] was supported by all members of the committee. We discussed the importance of bringing in the private enterprise system, and what it can do. We talked about the fact that we want to get away from the Government doing everything out of Washington, the fact that we do not like cen-

tralization of Government, and that the private sector should be involved.

Mr. President, hearings were held and it was unanimously agreed that the idea of greater private enterprise involvement is a good one. Some amendments were introduced by Republican Members and some amendments were introduced by Democratic Members, with everybody getting together and agreeing that we do want this kind of program. Now, in one amendment which is advocated on the floor, all of those programs would be eliminated in one fell swoop; almost all of the programs existing at the present time to bring in the private sector to focus on unemployment are going to be eliminated.

It does not make a great deal of sense when we realize that the statistics show that "subemployment" in our urban poverty areas varies from 27 percent to on up to 49.1 percent, and that unemployment on Indian reservations, and among Mexicans and Negroes is steadily growing higher instead of lower. This was a new and innovative way to approach the problem and now it is suggested that we eliminate it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope we reject the amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I think the remarks of the Senator from New York are valid because here is an opportunity for the Senate to bring the creative element of private enterprise into a cooperative effort with the Federal Government. I believe it is a partnership.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. A partnership is needed if we are to bring about employment and reemployment in America. We must mobilize our entire society if this Nation is to wage an effective battle against the conditions of poverty and lack of education under which so many of our citizenry exist. Our endeavors in this area must be creative, and our task will not be fulfilled in a matter of days or months or a year. The challenge of increasing opportunities for education, jobs, housing, health care, and for a better life for the low-income citizen involves a timespan of years. I believe that significant and constructive beginnings have been made—there has been meaningful progress. In many cases, this progress is very evident. The point is, however, that the stage has been set for the pulling in of our total resources in the attack against poverty. And our resources include the private enterprise system, which will exercise a vital role.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time, but I now yield to the Senator from Vermont 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I endorse what my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has just said.

Had the amendment which I offered yesterday been approved by the Senate, I would give serious consideration to the

proposal made by my distinguished colleague and friend, the Senator from Delaware. My amendment would have provided substantial funds for job training under both the existing NDTA legislation and through additional job training programs under the human investment approach. If this had been approved, I could consider cutting the present funds. However, since the effect of this cut would now be to reduce amounts expended for job training, I cannot agree. I am in favor of reducing expenditures where possible. Many Republicans, including myself, have made proposals to do so. But, we cannot afford to cut funds at the risk of discouraging private industry from entering the job training field.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware has 10 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the arguments advanced on the other side have a certain amount of merit when they discuss particular programs, but they overlook the fact that by the adoption of the pending amendment we are not destroying the program. Even with the adoption of this amendment, we would leave over \$2 billion in the bill, or 17 percent more than they had last year.

In addition to this bill there is pending in the Committee on Finance another bill which has the support of the administration and which would provide another \$6 billion for aid to the elderly, the handicapped, and family planning plus millions for the Job Corps. All of these programs are covered by other agencies.

At some point, somewhere, Congress must face its responsibility to reduce these expenditures. Programs cannot be financed with promises. If Congress is going to keep adopting and approving all of these increased spending programs we should be hearing speeches on the other side of the aisle supporting the 10 percent tax increase, or perhaps a tax increase of 15 or 18 percent. Significantly, most of those advocating the spending say that they are also against the tax increase.

What good is a promise to these people if they are not going to finance it and if they are not going to vote for the tax increase? If they are going to vote for a tax increase of 5 to 10 percent I would be glad to yield to them to state their position.

Those supporting these ever-expanding spending programs must accept the responsibility for the higher taxes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to ask a specific question of the Senator from Delaware. What is the President's recommendation of the total amount of money that should be allocated to this general program?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The President, through the Bureau of the Budget, asked Congress to approve \$2.06 billion to cover all phases of this program. The adoption of this amendment would give them every dime which the Bureau of the Budget said could be efficiently spent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that this same program was adopted in 1964, at which time we allocated to it about \$1 billion. In fiscal year 1968, according to the figures discussed, it has risen to \$2.06 billion on the basis of the President's recommendations; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. In addition, during the same period we have had other duplicating programs, with other agencies being built up into multimillion-dollar programs, all operating at the same time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not correct that there are job training programs in the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and also in OEO which fights the war on poverty?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. It was confirmed before our committee by the agencies themselves that the rivalry between the various agencies operating all in the same areas is resulting in an unnecessary waste of taxpayers' money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I intend to support the amendment authorized by the Senator from Delaware because I am convinced that \$2,060 million is an adequate amount to allocate to this program.

Of course I am conscious of the fact that we have job-training programs in the three departments I mentioned a moment ago. There seem to be so many of them that few are able to identify the job training programs which are being duplicated time and time again.

I cannot dismiss from my mind the fact that the President is asking for a 10-percent surtax and that while he is asking for that, I should also begin to subscribe to expenditures in excess of what he regarded and what he believed to be his best judgment in helping to solve the problems of those who are out of work or who are poor.

Mr. President, I shall not be placed in that class which votes for increased expenditures but will vote against taxes which the President has asked for. The two positions do not go hand in hand. If we adopt one, we must of necessity exclude the other. We cannot vote against the tax proposal and at the same time vote for increased expenditures.

I humbly say, Mr. President, that if we are going to get into the trouble which

the President now fears, it will be because of the adoption of the policy that we can expand on spending without increasing taxes. We just cannot do it and I shall not join with that group which advocates such an indefensible principal in the management of our Government.

I shall vote against the 10-percent surtax, and while I do so, I shall vote against expanding the spending recommended by the President.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield my remaining 2 minutes to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is under consideration here is something quite different from the \$2.8 billion added on in title II of the bill and deleted by the Senate yesterday. Insofar as that matter was concerned, no formal hearings had been held, although pertinent information was obtained incidentally during the course of the hearings on the bill itself.

So far as the tax bill is concerned, it is my intention, based on the information at my disposal and the accounts which have been given by reputable and knowledgeable witnesses, to vote for a 10-percent surtax as recommended by the President. I can see no other way out of the difficulty which faces this country and Congress at this time.

With respect to this bill, as a result of the hearings \$198 million was added to title I. I support the addition. I think this is a reasonable sum. The difficulties which have confronted the urban centers of the Nation during the past few months—difficulties which may confront them during this coming winter and which may continue as a way of life for some years to come—alone warrant this added authorization.

Ten million dollars will be used for special incentives for private employers to hire the disadvantaged.

Eighty million dollars will be available for the special impact programs established in urban ghettos and other areas.

Forty million dollars will be used for projects for the elderly, family planning, training, and health provisions.

There will be \$3 million for temporary housing for migrants and \$25 million for technical assistance to small business and low income areas; \$35 million for day care; and \$2 million for VISTA demonstration projects related to persons returning from correctional institutions.

All of these are worthy objectives.

It is my further understanding that the \$198 million indicated in the titles which I have just read were incorporated in the bill not because of Democratic initiative, but on the basis of bipartisan understanding and appreciation of the problems confronting this Nation at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would hope that the amendment to strike this part of the authorization would be rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr.

President, I respect the position of the majority leader, and I want to compliment him in that while he endorses the increase but he also endorses the tax increase to pay for it.

I take my hat off to any man who is willing to raise taxes to cover the cost of the money being spent.

I think that is the question which all of those who vote for the increased spending should begin to ask themselves.

There is merit in the job training programs, but I am not unmindful of the fact that there is a limit as to what we can afford in job training programs. We are today being told that they want to help train the 4 million to 5 million unemployed in this country, yet just a few days ago the Secretary of Labor issued a report pointing out how the booming economy under the administration there were less than 3 million unemployed in the country. This figure included those who were temporarily laid off as well as those poorly trained. Which figure is correct?

Where do they get these statistics? Are more people suddenly getting on poverty rolls, and is the administration planning on bankrupting another couple of million in the next 2 years by inflation which will result from their increased spending policies?

What concerns me is that the more we spend on these programs the larger the estimated number of unemployed gets.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do Senators yield back their remaining time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time is left on the other side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania has used up all his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time. Let us vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were free to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollell was concluded.

Mr. LAUSCHE (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MONTTOYA (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 280 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott	Ervin	Mundt
Baker	Fannin	Murphy
Bennett	Hansen	Proxmire
Bible	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Boggs	Holland	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Cannon	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cotton	Long, La.	Thurmond
Curtis	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	Miller	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—50

Aiken	Harris	Metcalf
Anderson	Hart	Mondale
Bartlett	Hartke	Morse
Bayh	Hatfield	Muskie
Brewster	Hayden	Nelson
Burdick	Inouye	Pearson
Case	Jackson	Pell
Church	Javits	Percy
Clark	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Cooper	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Dodd	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Scott
Fong	Magnuson	Stromming
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
Gore	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Griffin	McGovern	Yarborough
Gruening	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—14

Brooke	Lausche	Pastore
Carlson	Mansfield	Russell
Dirksen	Montoya	Talmadge
Hill	Morton	Young, Ohio
Hruska	Moss	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to

reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in this 2-week debate on the 1967 antipoverty bill we have explored a great many of the programs and projects which we devoutly hope will make major contributions, next year and in the years that follow, toward the eradication of penury and deprivation in this most affluent of all nations.

One of the programs that other Senators and I feel has been most successful, a program that we feel will have an enduring effect, is the OEO legal services program. To a large extent its success has been due to the active and abiding interest taken in its operations by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Senator KENNEDY's interest and support have helped make the OEO's legal aid program one of the most glowing accomplishments of the war on poverty.

On September 29 Senator KENNEDY made a memorable address on the subject of legal services for the poor to the OEO's Legal Services Northeast Regional Conference in New York City. It is an address that merits careful study by all Members of Congress and, indeed, by all Americans interested in seeing to it that American law does not discriminate, that it serves the rich and poor alike, people from all walks of life, without regard to race, color, creed, national origin, or economic status.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address by the Senator from Massachusetts appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I was extremely pleased and honored when Bill Greenawalt suggested that I join you here today. I am a member of both the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over many of the Federal Government's legal activities, and the Labor and Welfare Committee, which watches over the entire Poverty Program, including legal services. In this dual role I have taken a special interest in the OEO Legal Services Program and have sought to be your spokesman and your advocate in the Senate.

I do so because I firmly believe that Legal Services has been one of the most promising, and effective and exciting dimensions of the War on Poverty. Its product is seen not only in the specific result of its clients cases but perhaps more strikingly in its broader effects:

A new sense of participation in the social system by those who have been alienated from it;

A confidence in the ability of the law to be a force for good, in those who have only experienced it as an adversary;

The development of a sensitivity in official agencies to the impact of their actions and procedures on the poor;

A growing demonstration to the public that the legal profession has a heart and a conscience;

The increased attraction of law, as a life-work, for many of our most talented young people;

A stimulation of new social awareness and participation among the nation's law schools; And, finally, and perhaps in the long run, most important, the establishment of con-

tact and communication and understanding between the world of poverty and deprivation and injustice, and the separate, settled world of the bar leader, who with this new experience can be a strong force for social change and human progress.

Yet I hardly need convince this audience of the merits of the legal services concept or of its accomplishments. If the programs in your cities and states are running well, each of you, in one role or another, observes these phenomena first hand and daily.

Apart from my own interest in your work, I am especially pleased to be here today to help celebrate the second anniversary of the formal organization of the Legal Services unit in OEO. The progress since that day in 1965, when Clint Bamberger was sworn in, has been incredible. There are now nearly 300 programs funded, with 800 offices and 1,800 attorneys, at an annual cost of over \$40 million.

In fact, of course, the Federal Government's involvement in the law and poverty field goes back beyond 1965. It was in the Fall of 1963 that the first Federal funds went to a neighborhood legal office right here in New York, as part of the prototype of the Poverty Program which was developed under the 1961 Juvenile Delinquency Act. But we can go back still further. For the spirit which guided the Federal planners in 1963 and 1965 traces back to the vital work in the field of criminal justice for the poor which preceded, and laid the necessary predicate for, Federal entry into the civil legal field. Less than three months after President Kennedy's inauguration, the Justice Department was immersed in the problems of the poor defendant. The Attorney General appointed a Committee on Poverty and the Administration of Federal Criminal Justice, now known as the Allen Committee. The now famous Allen Report cited Judge Learned Hand's remarks that "If we are to keep our democracy, there must be one commandment: Thou shalt not ration justice." The Report added, "One of the prime objectives of the civilized administration of justice is to render the poverty of the litigant an irrelevancy."

That is the course the Federal Government has pursued for the past six years. The Allen Report, the establishment of the Office of Criminal Justice in the Justice Department, the passage of the Criminal Justice Act, the funding of the early Legal Services Programs, the establishment of the OEO, and the formation of the OEO Legal Services Program, all form a continuum of which we here are part.

One would think that a program with this history and these roots would be well-embedded and well-accepted by now, especially when it has received the support and assistance of the organized bar at every step of the way.

Yet incredibly enough, in the past several days we have witnessed the irony of the very success of the Program leading to a re-questioning of its basic principles and purposes. One Congressman stood on the floor of the House and gave what he intended to be a scathing attack on one OEO funded Legal Services Program, but which seemed to me to contain the highest kind of praise. He said that the lawyers for the poor had brought the entire Department of Labor into "groveling submission," that the Department had "paid tribute to a rump organization which suckles the Federal Poverty Program for its existence." He called the settlement agreed to by the Labor Department a "surrender document" and pointed out in horror that it would enable the poverty lawyers to insure continuing review of the disputed issue and full access to the information necessary to bring future cases.

Now the lesson I would take from his words is that here was a program that had

identified an injustice, made it visible through the initiation of litigation, and had achieved not only the possibility of relief in the particular plaintiffs' cases, but also a means of future relief in future cases. This would certainly seem to be legal services at its finest.

Yet the Congressman saw a different message. He could not understand how one entity funded by the Federal Government could do battle with another Federal entity. He saw an infringement by the Poverty lawyers into the Labor Department's territory. He saw the filing of a suit as blackmail and coercion. He implied a lack of legitimate standing and interest in the Legal Services Agency, because it existed only by the grace of OEO.

At this point in time, I don't think anyone could take seriously the resultant proposal by this Congressman and others that the Legal Services Programs be prohibited from filing cases against government agencies. Your task is to assist your clients in resisting and rooting out injustice wherever it is found. If it is found in the laws or regulations or practices which govern the government, then they must be attacked. If you refuse to do this, then you can hardly convince your communities that you are a force for justice, nor, most likely, can you be much help to them.

If fact, to some extent the heat of the opposition to your work may be a good barometer of your success. If you are not perturbing someone in some government each week, then the chances are that you are not doing an effective job. For your job is to change the status quo, when the status quo ignores the needs, and problems and legitimate aspirations of the poor. As lawyers, you have no more right to be reticent about taking on a government agency than the Justice Department's lawyers have when they take on the FCC or the Comptroller of Currency, or than the defense lawyer paid with Federal Criminal Justice Act funds has when he takes on the U.S. Attorney.

We had another relevant example presented to us during the riot hearings in the Judiciary Committee. A policeman from Newark complained that lawyers from the Legal Services Program were advising demonstrators as to their legal rights and obligations during picketing of city officials. One Senator recoiled in horror at the thought of Federally-paid attorneys performing such a function. Yet now can anyone doubt the desirability of having dissatisfied citizens know what the legal limits on their activities are, and at the same time having the police in the heat of conflict know that they are on their best behavior. The effect can only be moderation and caution on both sides. The alternative may be, as we have seen repeatedly this summer, one of those small incidents which can spark an orgy of lawlessness, or at least an abuse of privilege on one side or of power on the other, leading to increased tension and frustration.

Again I would hope that there is no doubt on these questions in this audience. But I think it is healthy to review them in our minds regularly to make sure that we have not slipped unconsciously into a posture we would not consciously assume. The fact is that the first "acceptance" stage of your programs is past. You have the support of the Bar, of the Congress, of the public, and of the Executive Branch. And more and more you have the support, as well, of local leaders. They realize that the kind of change you bring about, and the way you bring it about, are good for the entire community. So you need not be shy, or timid or fearful. I do not think anyone, not even Congress, could turn the clock backwards on Legal Services now.

The question really is where we are heading as the clock goes forward. We have discovered, or aroused, a demand for legal

services. How is it to be met? How should the supply be rationed where demand cannot be met? Here again you have an obligation to proceed boldly. For in your discussions here, in the law reviews, in the symposia, in the proceedings of the 1965 Conference on Law and Poverty, you will find a whole spectrum of proposals, suggestions, ideas, and issues which should be explored and developed. You have before you large immediate questions, such as the division of lawyer time between routine cases and test cases, the possible use of supplementary lay personnel, and the standards of indigency. And you have large, long-term issues, like the proposed development of new forms of group legal services legal insurance, the role of mediation and arbitration, and the formulation of new mechanisms and new directions to combat the roots of poverty by providing adequate housing, employment education, and health care. And you have smaller questions like library access, salaries, relationships, to CAP's and so on.

As an interested outsider let me express the hope that your discussion of all these subjects can be open and frank, with no holds barred and no taboos. All of us must constantly reexamine the foundations on which our traditional ethical, procedural, and philosophical approaches to the law stand. For times and conditions and needs change. And perhaps some of the constraints we lawyers put on our own activities need updating, too.

And let me express the hope as well that your discussions here can lead to action, that you can go back home with the determination and courage to experiment with new ideas and new assumptions. For example, I am sure someone here will suggest that you be more selective in accepting cases, that you avoid overloading your lawyers with so many service cases that they turn into impersonal automations giving routinized attention to a continuous stream of clients. You will be told that your client population will understand, if you explain that turning some away gives you more time to concentrate on, and win, cases which will benefit many people at one time, cases which might change the whole fabric of community life by changing the basic nature of relationships with landlords, loansharks, retail stores, or welfare agencies. You may be told that the community can be kept involved if you appoint a citizen advisory committee to help select the general kinds of cases which should receive emphasis. It will then be easy for you just to say "that's nice," and quietly go home. But you can do yourselves and all the other programs a favor if you try some of the suggestions out, analyze them, and report your results. For no professor sitting in his office, and no administrator sitting in Washington can do what you can do or learn what you can learn. You are where the action is.

You are also in a unique position to play another vital role. Because your clients are at the receiving end of so many governmental practices and procedures, you can see, in a way which government administrators can never see, exactly how their agencies are operating *vis a vis* the ordinary citizen. Your descriptions, your assessments, and your suggestions, whether communicated directly to the agencies involved, or through legislative representatives, can have a direct result. Most government officials want their staffs to do a good job and a fair job, but they may not know of long-accepted, inbred abuses and barriers unless you make these visible.

This is really a two-sided job. You can provide the information about the many government programs you come in contact with. And there are many other direct and indirect government programs which impinge on every facet of our daily lives. In each of these there can be an important dif-

ference if the factors of poverty, inexperience, or lack of education are not taken into account. The Department of Justice discovered, for example, that the rules governing settlement of damage cases against the government were such that they caused people to file suits and incur legal expenses for small claims when quick administrative settlements would have been feasible and proper. The result was a change in rules which will benefit many hundreds of citizens every year. And similar instances can arise in all sorts of activities large and small.

In fact we in the Federal Government should be doing more than we are, both legislatively and administratively to see how each of our activities affects the poor or disadvantaged. Are we making people incur bus costs and miss work in order to fill out forms in person which could be filed by mail? Are our welfare standards causing families to break up? Are our farm programs, home mortgage programs, park programs complementing or contradicting our anti-poverty programs? Do we make dealing with the government so complex that poor people either stay away or feel impelled to secure unnecessary attorney services.

As I have said, you can help us to identify many of these issues, and I am hopeful you will; but we also have to do a better job within the government to get our own house in order. Certainly changes in housing and welfare regulations, for example, could moot many of your cases. And in these cases an administrative policy win, may be worth several judicial wins.

I know you have a good deal of talking to do yourselves, so I will vacate the rostrum now. Again my thanks to you all for having me here today. I congratulate each of you for taking part in this important task of assuring citizens of every status a chance to see that the full majesty of the law is meant to serve not just some of the people, but all of the people.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are we under controlled time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time is under control.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE SUPPORTS WIRETAPPING

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on September 26, the Judicial Conference of the United States endorsed legislation to permit Federal and State law enforcement officers to wiretap and eavesdrop electronically, under court observation and supervision. Since then, a number of newspaper articles and editorials have been published regarding this endorsement.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Judges Back Bill To Ease Wiretaps," written by Fred P. Graham and published in the New York Times of Wednesday, September 27, 1967; an editorial entitled "Judges Back Wire-

taps," published in the Washington Daily News of September 28, 1967; and an editorial entitled "Wiretap Support," published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, September 30, 1967.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1967]
JUDGES BACK BILL TO EASE WIRETAPS—PERMISSIVE RULES ENDORSED BY FEDERAL CONFERENCE

(By Fred P. Graham)

WASHINGTON, September 26.—The Judicial Conference of the United States threw its weight yesterday behind an effort in Congress to legalize court-approved wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by state and Federal policemen.

In a letter to Senator James O. Eastland, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Judicial Conference endorsed a permissive wiretap bill that has the support of many Republicans and conservative Southerners and is opposed by the Johnson Administration.

The bill, introduced by Senator John L. McClellan, Arkansas Democrat, would permit law enforcement officials, in investigating certain serious crimes, to tap telephone wires and plant hidden microphones in private premises under court orders.

Under the bill, judges could approve eavesdropping in a broad spectrum of crimes, ranging from graft and bribery to murder and espionage. Information picked up by the listening devices would be admissible in court under the bill.

LONG BILL BACKED

The Johnson Administration has supported a proposal introduced by Senator Edward V. Long, a Missouri Democrat, that would outlaw all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping by state and Federal police, except in internal security investigations.

The Judicial Conference, which consists of ranking Federal judges from across the nation and is headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, told Mr. Eastland that it approved the purposes of the McClellan bill, "providing that it be amended to comply with the standards set forth in the opinion of the Supreme Court in *Berger v. New York*."

In that 5-to-4 decision, which was handed down June 12, the Court struck down New York's permissive police bugging law on the ground that it did not meet the search and seizure standards of the Fourth Amendment.

Legal scholars have since debated whether any effective statute could be drafted to satisfy the standards that were mentioned in general terms in the *Berger* opinion. The opinion by Justice Tom C. Clark implied that any valid law would have to include such safeguards as limited time periods of surveillance and notice to the subjects of the eavesdropping.

Although these requirements might be met through such devices as periodic disclosure of the names of those who had been bugged, the dissenting Justices warned that the rigid standards might prove to be impossible to meet.

However, proponents of legalized police bugging have insisted that the *Berger* case was intended by the Court to be an invitation for Congress to pass a detailed law, and Republicans have charged that organized crime cannot be brought under control without it.

EXISTING LAW CITED

Under existing law, wiretapping is a Federal felony and wiretap information is not admissible as evidence in United States courts. Electronic eavesdropping with hidden microphones is not outlawed by present Federal statutes, but United States officials have been forbidden by Attorney General Ramsey Clark to use it.

The Judicial Conference also urged Con-

gress to pass "as quickly as possible" a bill designed to provide a cross-section of the population on Federal District Court jury panels. The bill, which was drafted by a special committee of judges headed by Judge Irving I. Kauffman of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, would require that prospective jurors' names be picked by lot from voter lists.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 28, 1967]

THE JUDGES BACK WIRETAPS

Federal judges from all over the country have endorsed the proposal to legalize circumspet wiretapping and bugging in criminal cases.

The indorsement was approved at a meeting of the National Judicial Conference, composed of the chief judges of the circuit courts, district judges from each circuit and the presiding judges of special courts. Chief Justice Warren is chairman of the conference.

The bill before Congress would permit law enforcement officers to use wiretaps and bugs in investigating serious crimes—such as espionage, murder, kidnaping—and especially organized rackets and crimes involving national security.

Before using these devices, a law officer would be required to obtain permission from a court, and the judges recommended that these petitions should be specific about the crimes and the evidence which might be acquired. This evidence would be admissible at trials.

Also the bill would outlaw wiretaps and bugging by other than law officers.

As it is, evidence obtained from wiretaps is not admissible in Federal courts, and the Supreme Court last spring nullified a New York state law which authorized wiretapping under rigid conditions. But private wiretappers virtually are free to ply their sneak trade.

A wiretap law would provide an important—and sometimes the only—means of gathering convincing evidence in many instances. It ought to be used.

The Johnson Administration, while calling for an all-out drive against crime, for some inscrutable reason balks at using wiretaps, even under the most restricted conditions.

The judges, it seem to us are much more practical.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 30, 1967]

WIRETAP SUPPORT

The drive during this session of Congress to pass legislation permitting the use of wiretaps and electronic bugs has received a helping hand from an unexpected source. At least, support from this source—the Judicial Conference of the United States—was unexpected as far as we are concerned.

What the conference did was to go on record as approving the "purposes" of Senator McClellan's wiretap bill, provided it is amended to conform to the requirements announced by the Supreme Court last June in its decision in the *Berger* case. That decision struck down a conviction obtained under a New York law which permitted the use of wiretaps and bugs in certain types of cases and under judicial supervision. As far as the constitutionality of that law was concerned, the court divided 5 to 4, with Justice Tom Clark, now retired, writing the majority opinion.

It would be unwise to read too much into the action by the judicial conference, which consists of Chief Justice Warren, the chief judges of the 11 federal appellate courts and perhaps a dozen federal district court judges. It does not mean that any law which may finally emerge from Congress is assured of judicial approval. But at the very least, it would seem to mean that the judicial conference recognizes the need for appropriate legislation in this area. And this is in refresh-

ing contrast to the attitude of Attorney General Ramsey Clark and President Lyndon Johnson, who are backing a bill which would outlaw all wiretaps and bugging except in what they choose to consider national security cases.

Almost everyone having anything to do with law enforcement, except the President and his attorney general, recognizes the need for wiretaps and bugging. Let's mention just two. Justice Black wrote a scathing dissent in the Berger case. Pointing out that Berger was a briber and a corrupter of public officials, Justice Black said: It cannot be denied "that to deal with such specimens of our society, eavesdroppers are not merely useful, they are frequently a necessity." In recent days, Representative Poff of Virginia, chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime, has released a statement by the Association of Federal Investigators, representing 1,000 federal career employees active in law enforcement. The association says electronic surveillance devices "are necessary, useful and effective investigative weapons, particularly where organized crime cases are concerned."

Yet Ramsey Clark and Lyndon Johnson, heads deeply buried in the theoretical sand, insist that these devices, though necessary in national security cases, are of no value in dealing with other types of crime. Which prompts us to ask once again: Why?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this announced support of wiretap and eavesdrop legislation by the Federal judiciary should weigh heavily with Members of Congress. Such endorsement, it seems to me, should dispel any fears that court authorized and supervised wiretapping and eavesdropping might be abused, since it is the judges themselves who would have such operations under their jurisdiction, constant surveillance, and control.

I call to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted by the National Association of Attorneys General, supporting court-supervised electronic surveillance, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION XIV, FEDERAL LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING LIMITED ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

(Resolution adopted by 61st annual meeting, National Association of Attorneys General, August 30, 1967, Portland, Oreg.)

Whereas we believe that modern law enforcement, in order to be both effective and law abiding, must not be denied the right to use advanced, scientific methods of crime detection, including electronic surveillance; and

Whereas at the same time we recognize the strong public interest in guarding the right to privacy of law-abiding individuals and against the dangers of abuse of electronic devices and hence the need for devising safeguards, controls, and restrictions applicable to their use;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the 61st Annual Meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General in Portland, Oregon that we favor in principle federal legislation now pending before the Congress, permitting the use of electronic surveillance devices limited to federal and, where authorized by state law, state enforcement agencies, under strict supervision by the courts, along principles applicable to the issuance of search warrants and confined to specifically enumerated classes of cases involving serious crimes and organized criminal activities, as each state may deem appropriate.

(The States of Kentucky, New Jersey and New Mexico were recorded as voting "no.")

Mr. McCLELLAN. I also call to the attention of my fellow Senators a letter to the editor of the Washington Star, published in that newspaper on October 3, 1967, signed by the 23 members of the July Federal Grand Jury No. 1 of Washington, D.C., entitled "A Jury Looks at Crime," in which that Federal grand jury emphasizes that the pendulum has swung too far in one direction, and that the scales need to be balanced.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JURY LOOKS AT CRIME

SIR: Can it be that 23 people sitting on a grand jury cannot come to some reasonable accurate conclusions regarding crimes and their handling in our city? We are not lawyers, prosecutors or judges, and we grant our ignorance in many of the subtleties of law, but we are people from many walks in life with many experiences to help us in arriving at some sound conclusions. We should be able to at least observe the obvious.

It may be that some people have forgotten, but we would like to again remind them, that there are people who commit crimes. At some time in the past they were referred to as criminals and society was protected from them. Perhaps too harshly in many cases.

But we feel that the pendulum has swung too far. After two months of duty we find ourselves amazed and shocked at the exaggerated considerations given to those who roam our streets indulging themselves in acts of the most outrageous nature. Pity the mother who is silly enough to think that the child molester will not be back in a few days after being caught redhanded. Pity the teller or shopkeeper who thinks he won't see the robber again before the week is over. If the criminal does not return, it will not be because of our police, prosecutors, legislators or judges. It will be because the criminal only chooses to commit his crime elsewhere.

Police and prosecutors have made serious mistakes in the past and will make them in the future, but by and large we have been impressed by the high caliber of these officials. But how can they work with the limitations being imposed upon them?

As an example, the Bail and Bond Act in force at this time allows any prime suspect to be free in hours except where he has committed a capital crime or it appears he will "skip" bail. We have our legislators to thank for that and any number of unsound laws.

If you happen to decide to murder someone in the near future, feel free to confess to one of a hundred people. Unless you are informed of your rights in the most precise terminology, the odds are that the judiciary branch will see to your freedom.

We are aware that there are a fantastic variety of reasons for a criminal act as well as good and bad police, judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, rights groups and hard-headed conservatives, but we must protest the injustices being laid upon the law-abiding majority of our society. When can we look forward to a balancing of the scales?

23 Members, July Federal Grand Jury No. 1.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 1411) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 1411) to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, strike out lines 18 and 19, and insert in lieu thereof "There is authorized to be appropriated \$2,360,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I ask for the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the manager of the bill.

This is an amendment designed to cure what I think is a fundamental defect in procedure, by placing a specific amount on an authorization. At the present time, the authorization with reference to the 1969 fiscal year simply says "Such sums as may be appropriated," which means that the Appropriations Committee does not have the faintest idea as to what the authorization should be; and which also means that Congress has not gone ahead, in a legislative manner, and stated what it believes its authorization figure should be.

Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have had a feeling, which I think has been shared by the majority of Senators, that we should state an authorization figure in every piece of legislation we pass. The particular figure I have chosen is \$102 million more than the total authorization for fiscal 1968, thereby gives us some room for the inflationary process which seems to be so prevalent today.

I see no objection to it, frankly. It can still be apportioned in whatever way Congress or the Appropriations Committee wants to. I would hope that the Senator from Pennsylvania would accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side, so that I may confer with the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unan-

imous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I modify the figure in my amendment to \$2.4 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accordingly modified.

Mr. DOMINICK. On that basis, it is my understanding that the Senator from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment.

The purpose of the amendment is to keep consistent our rule that we should have a specific authorization in any legislative matter of this kind.

I think it is also important to point out that this makes the bill not a bill for \$2,258 million, but for \$4,158 million over a 2-year period, which will, I think, emphasize the amount of money that it is being poured into this program.

I think this is important for the country at large to realize.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am receptive to the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado. However, I would like to address a question to him as a matter of legislative history.

I ask the Senator from Colorado, who is a valued member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, whether it is not correct that if the administration should decide it wants a higher sum next year than \$2,400 million, or if the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare should want to hold hearings to determine whether the authorization should be increased next year, that would be entirely feasible.

Mr. DOMINICK. It certainly would. I think the figure is entirely open for Congress to take whatever action they need to take next year. If we are in very bad fiscal shape then, we may want to cut the figure back.

The purpose is to lay some ground work for the carrying on of a program which has no set figure for the fiscal year 1969.

Mr. CLARK. The reason why the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare left the amount open was that it felt there was so much uncertainty with respect to the future of the poverty program and the possibility of further riots this winter or next summer.

There are too many variables to attempt to fix a realistic figure at this time and have it accepted by the Senate. That was a possibility we were not prepared to face up to. Nevertheless, the Senator from Colorado has made a strong case.

I wonder what the views of my friend, the Senator from Vermont, are on this matter. He being the ranking minority member on the committee, I would be inclined to accept the amendment if it were agreeable to the Senator from Vermont.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont. Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very happy to support the amendment introduced by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

It is as both the Senators from Pennsylvania and Colorado pointed out, sound

legislative procedure for the Senate to place a specific amount on authorizations. It will be a guideline to the Appropriation Subcommittee. The amount agreed upon should be adequate. However, I would like to point out that under the amendment which I offered last Friday, and which was accepted, the Comptroller General will in 1969 report to Congress regarding the poverty program. From this report, and in the future we should be able to better assess the needs of the program, and be better able to make changes at that time.

I have no objection to the amendment and will support it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I am prepared to accept the amendment, to fix the authorization for fiscal 1969 at \$2.4 billion.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I wish to make it crystal clear that I am not saying that we should go forward with the poverty program in fiscal 1969 at a rate of \$2.4 billion. It is my opinion that we can do more for the poor in other ways than we can under the poverty program as it is now organized. But whether I believe this or not, it is important to follow through on our legislative procedures, one of which is to require a specific sum in an authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 98 line 21, strike out "SEC. 636" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 636(a)".

On page 99, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(b) No financial assistance shall be extended under this act for the purposes of voter registration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. President, I am becoming increasingly alarmed over the use of funds appropriated by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purpose of increasing voter registration.

On September 3, I watched 83 percent of the registered voters, or some 56 percent of the eligible voters, in South Vietnam walk into the voting booths to cast a ballot for democratic government. Some of them arrived wrapped in bandages, on crutches, or assisted by their fellow citizens who had not been injured by the Vietcong terrorist activities aimed at preventing them from voting and demonstrating their belief that a better

way of life could be had than that which exists under a Communist yoke of oppression.

They voted because they cared. Yet, here in America, without the echo of explosions and the fear of death, 83 percent of the people have never voted in a presidential election. To my mind, this is a travesty. Election day in Vietnam was the greatest example I have ever witnessed of people demonstrating their determination to live under a democratic form of government, while here in America we have to coax and beg people to exercise their right to vote.

One reason ascribed to the lack of participation is economic and social impoverishment. Yet, the people who voted in Vietnam, I would venture to say, were far more impoverished than the people living in our great land. The Office of Economic Opportunity, nevertheless, has decided that part of its task should be to "get out the vote." Included within its community action program in some parts of the country has been a drive to register voters.

While a nonpartisan voter participation drive in no way violates the Hatch Act or OEO regulations, I sincerely question the propriety of using taxpayers' dollars for this purpose. I am quite certain that it was never the intent of Congress that funds set aside to help the poor should be used for the purpose of voter registration. Surely, there are programs more necessary—more improvements of immediate importance—for which we can spend tax dollars in order to make the disadvantaged individual a real participant in his community and his nation. This is the intent of the community action program, and I do not believe that a voter registration drive, no matter how carefully it is supervised in order to make certain that it is nonpartisan, is a priority item.

In Reading, in Berks County, Pa., the League of Women Voters last month aided the Economic Opportunity Council by lending technical assistance and training community service aides under the summer opportunity program to register voters. My colleague, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], aptly pointed out that while the local EOC was lending its staff and money to accomplish this drive, the OEO was compelled to deny a program application designed to aid retarded children in McKean County because of lack of funds. This I consider an excellent example of very bad judgment in the allocation of poverty funds.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to point out that I learned of the activity of OEO in the city of Reading, in Berks County, Pa., and found, to my astonishment, that a function which normally should be performed by such civic organizations as the American Heritage Foundation, the League of Women Voters, and so on, would be undertaken by OEO with taxpayers' money—namely, the registration of voters.

I am in favor of the registration of voters. I will support every movement for the registration of voters. But I do not

favor the covert, rather slick, and, in my mind, definitely underhanded way in which voters were carefully selected and registered from areas where only one political party was dominant, where the county chairmen of both political parties were solicited to support this program and did so in good faith, without any idea that it would not be a broad, general registration program, but would, in fact, undertake registration of the most partisan aspect.

I received a letter from Sargent Shriver; and, as usual, he jumped high in the air at the moment anyone criticizes the OEO, whether one is right or wrong. In my opinion, I happen to be right. He said in his letter to me, if I can recall the phraseology—I will paraphrase it as closely as I can—that he is doing what the law permits. He gives the impression that he is doing what the law encourages.

I am not aware that any part of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 says that you may go out and register voters of a single political party in selected areas, anywhere in the United States, with taxpayers' money. If the act permits such activity, or if those charged with its administration believe that it does, I am for stopping it, and I hope we will; and I support the amendment offered by the Senator from California and the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator. That is exactly the purpose of the amendment, stated much better than I would be capable of stating it.

In early June of this year, it was brought to my attention that the Santa Clara County, Calif., Economic Opportunity Commission intended to establish a voter registration drive. At that time I sent a letter to Mr. Shriver, and on June 26 I received his reply. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these two letters be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

JUNE 8, 1967.

Mr. SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SARGE: It has recently been called to my attention that the Economic Opportunity Commission in Santa Clara County, California, intends to establish a voter registration program.

The task of voter registration has been undertaken by both political parties, the California Non-Partisan Registration Committee, the Chamber of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, and many other groups in the past. To my mind there is little need for the local arm of the Office of Economic Opportunity to embark on such a program utilizing Federal funds. I would prefer to believe that local community action activities are directed towards advancement in the area of education and job-skill development. Granted that the cohesiveness of a community may be important in waging a battle against poverty within that community, and that attention can certainly be paid to this end by the E.O.C., I, nevertheless, do not envision a voter registration program in this spirit. It seems to me that such a program, while it might not result in direct political action certainly offers the opportunity for such activity.

Consequently, I hope you will be kind enough to inform me of the structural operation of this program as it is being designed by the Santa Clara County E.O.C. and to advise me of the names of any other Community Action Programs throughout the country which are presently, or are intending to embark on similar activities.

Thanking you in advance, I am,

Sincerely,

GEORGE MURPHY.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,

Washington, D.C. June 26, 1967.

Hon. GEORGE MURPHY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: Thank you for your letter inquiring about the voter registration program in Santa Clara.

The Santa Clara Economic Opportunity Commission (SCEOC), with which the program has been linked both in the press and in the minds of many people, is neither financing nor itself conducting a registration drive. The confusion over SCEOC's role arose on May 18 when Dr. Stanley Skillicorn, in his final report as outgoing president of SCEOC, suggested that there should be a county-wide voter registration program for the poor.

Plans were then made to establish a joint committee of SCEOC and the county-wide Santa Clara League of Women Voters organizations to pursue the idea. This committee has not yet been set up. However, the Central Santa Clara League of Women Voters, one of the four local chapters of the League, has now decided to conduct a voter registration drive on its own, and SCEOC has offered to help locate volunteers for that drive, which has not yet begun. We understand that certain SCEOC neighborhood workers in the Morgan-Hill area, who are already licensed by the county as deputy voting registrars, may have done some individual voter registration. This appears to be the entire extent of SCEOC's current involvement in registration activities.

Non-partisan voter registration projects are undertaken as part of local community action programs—which, as you know, vary with every community action agency—such as multi-purpose neighborhood centers, community development programs, community organization programs, and the like. To obtain a complete list of community action agencies involved in such activities would, therefore, require a canvass of each of the approximately 1100 community action agencies in the country.

All CAP activities, however, must be carried out under stipulations of community action guidelines. I enclose Community Action Memo 50-A and draw your attention particularly to part D, pages 5 and 6, which emphasizes the strictly non-partisan nature we require of all such activities. If a community action agency should violate these guidelines, we would, of course, not allow the expenditure of OEO funds and would take whatever other measures are appropriate for the individual case.

I sincerely hope that this explains to you satisfactorily our policy regarding voter registration.

Thank you for your continued interest in our programs.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not have copies of those letters. Will the Senator give me copies?

Mr. MURPHY. I will.

While Mr. Shriver is correct in saying that nonpartisan voter registration proj-

ects do not violate the stipulations of community action program guidelines, particularly those of Community Action Memo 50-A, I cannot believe that such a program is a priority program. I am certain that there are many programs to help the poor that need more immediate attention than does this. Furthermore, this type of program might easily result in political activity which would be violative of the Hatch Act.

In order to demonstrate what might be the end result of activity which begins as a nonpartisan voter registration drive, I should like to call the attention of Senators to the report by the Comptroller General of the United States—dated May 1967—entitled, "Report on Investigation of Alleged Political and Union Activities by Certain Grantees Under Grants by the Office of Economic Opportunity." After reviewing recent activities in Palm Beach County, Fla., the GAO concluded that two community action fund—funded by the OEO—employees were appointed as deputy voting registrars; that while the registration in Palm Beach County is predominantly Democratic and that the ratio of Negro voters in the county is up to 14 to 1 Democratic, the persons registered by the two CAF employees registered Democratic at a ratio of more than 100 to 1; and that CAF employees "were extensively engaged in transporting farmworkers to voter registration places over a period of several months and in transporting voters to the polls on November 8, 1966, and that grant funds were used for these purposes." I have also heard rumors of similar activity taking place in several areas in the great State of Texas.

Senators may remember the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27 by Congressman GARDNER regarding the work of Operation Breakthrough in Durham, N.C., while local OEO activities may often stay within the confines of the law and OEO regulations, Operation Breakthrough, which did exactly that—it broke through the regulations—had its workers drive voters to the polls and hand them sample ballots already marked, something I never saw while I was in Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, maybe they should have gone to Durham, N.C., to observe elections there.

What is the effectiveness of a voter registration drive? Is it worth the money? The Springfield, Mass., News, on July 22, 1967, reported that six VISTA volunteers, working over a 4-week period, attempted to register some 800 citizens. Only 106 of these completed the registration procedure. At this point, I must wonder whether these six volunteers could not have accomplished something far more constructive over a 4-week period than register 4.3 voters each a week.

Mr. President, it is deeply disturbing to me that the Office of Economic Opportunity has decided to allow its local

community action programs to divert their efforts and funds from educational and job developmental services, which are so badly needed. Also, I would like to point out that taxpayer-financed registration programs could very easily lend themselves to perversions so as to fulfill the political ambitions of the leaders of the local arm of the war on poverty. This would result in an ultimate disservice to the people the program was designed to serve. Consequently, I would hope that my colleagues see fit to amend section 636 of S. 2388 by adding a new subsection stating:

No financial assistance shall be extended under this Act for the purposes of voter registration.

Local poverty warriors should not become involved in voter registration, while they are working on the poverty program. This most commendable activity should be conducted on their own time without Federal funding. This is not a poverty program by any figment of the imagination. Furthermore, registration drives which have begun as non-partisan can easily develop into a partisan operation. The OEO should never be permitted to operate as such. In that it has been unable to control itself, Mr. President, I believe that prohibitive legislation is now necessary.

Mr. President, from the very beginning, I have fought as hard as I could to keep politics out of the poverty program. I hope that Senators will vote in favor of this amendment designed to benefit the poor by keeping funds from being expended on a nonpriority program.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I can think of nothing more likely to endanger the success of the war on poverty than to have poverty workers, poverty volunteers, and community action agencies become actively involved in partisan politics. The few mistakes of voter canvassing by poverty workers which have been publicized substantiate my feeling that such drives cannot escape being partisan, and as such should be forbidden. Since I am very concerned about making our poverty programs successful, I hope very much that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will find it possible to accept the amendment. We must insure that poverty workers attend fully to their work of reducing poverty rather than becoming pawns in the hands of partisan governments at the local level.

I highly commend the distinguished Senator from California for proposing the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall need only 1 minute.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as a cosponsor, I strongly support the amendment offered by the Senator from California. Certainly it was never intended by Congress that public money be used to finance registration whereby either political party could channel the money into districts where they would have an overwhelming advantage. Whether it is so intended or not that is the result, and, in my opinion, the present law would already have precluded that. However, since the law has not been interpreted differently and we know there has been public money used for registering voters, I think the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. President, I wish to point out one additional fact. Ofttimes these programs are financed partly by public contributions, which, for instance, may raise \$25,000, and the Government will match that amount with \$100,000 or \$125,000. We then are faced with the question as to whether or not this matching money would be deductible for tax purposes. If there happens to be an educational group sponsoring the registration drive the private money could be tax deductions. If this practice is not stopped we will have a situation where private contributions could be made and a tax credit received, while at the same time the money would be used for the political registration of voters.

Mr. President, we have just passed an election reform bill, and certainly it would be a backward step if this procedure is not stopped before it gets out of hand. This is a gray area as to whether or not these contributions, which are matching the Government money, would be tax-exempt. I have discussed the matter with the staff; and they are unable to give a categorical answer, but they admit that in some instances it could be tax-exempt.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator.

(At this point Mr. BIBLE assumed the chair.)

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from California. I shall do so because, in my opinion, we would be entering into a most dangerous field in spending the money of taxpayers to participate in elections.

The object here is to augment registrations at the voting places. Those who are in charge should not be put in the dangerous position of using their office to promote the success of one political party or the other. This is a field that the Government should stay out of. No administrator should be put into this haphazardous position of handling money in the field in the election of officers to the Government of the United States. What

I have said applies to Democrats and it applies to Republicans. A dangerous precedent would be established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio.

From the beginning of our experience in Los Angeles there was a political tug of war that held up the poverty program for over 18 months. I am sure that happened in other parts of the country.

I am in complete favor of registering the greatest number of voters. I have worked on this matter for over 25 years of my life. However, I do not think this is a proper application of poverty funds which are designed to help the poor. I know that an argument can be made that it was perhaps a part of instruction in the rights of citizenship. I would agree if it were limited to that. I would not have proposed the amendment if it were limited to that, but the temptation of taking political advantage might be too great. Therefore, I have proposed the amendment. I thank Senators for supporting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this is a matter about which I do not believe the committee feels very strongly, but I do think the case made by the Senator from California has been somewhat exaggerated.

I looked carefully into the situation in Reading, Berks County, Pa., after my colleague became somewhat aroused about the matter. I find that the OEO community action summer program in Reading was funded for \$65,000. I reiterate that it was a summer program and, therefore, a temporary program. The local community action agency wanted to spend \$3,000 of that amount for a voter registration drive in the city of Reading, where registration was pretty low.

They went first to the chairman of the Democratic county committee and then to the chairman of the Republican county committee, and they both endorsed the registration drive, publicly and in print. Thereupon, they went to the League of Women Voters, a well-known nonpartisan agency for training young people they send to register non-registered voters. They found 15 youngsters aged 16 to 21, all of them from low-income families, and they got all their training and instruction from the League of Women Voters. As a result of that, they went through with the registration projects. I do not know whether they registered more Republicans than Democrats; but let me say with respect to the argument about using the taxpayers' money, I assume that many Senators are

familiar with conditions in local municipalities throughout the State.

In Philadelphia, as my colleague knows, we have had for many years a bipartisan registration commission which conducts an active drive each year for registering. They send traveling registrars all around the city. They advertise in newspapers that they are coming to a particular district for the purpose of registration. When I was mayor—and the practice has been continued since—I always appointed a bipartisan citizens committee to promote registration with cochairmen, one a Republican and one a Democrat.

Thus, I do not see anything particularly wrong with this practice. As I said, I do not feel too strongly about it. Concerning Durham, N.C., that was a nonpartisan election. Candidates on the ballot were not permitted to have any particular affiliation.

Mr. MURPHY and Mr. SCOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania, from my time, 2 of my precious minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be very brief. I do not want to make this a sort of confrontation, but I do want to make my point clear.

Let me say that I would not object if some people encourage registration on their own time and at their own expense. I do not think it is right to register anyone with taxpayers' money, regardless of party, because I think that the money should be used to fight poverty. At the very time I was trying to get money for a children's program way up in McKean County, I did not like to see \$3,000 diverted to the city of Reading and invested in an area, for voter registration, where it was well known to the citizens of Reading that it was inhabited only by members of one party, even though other low-income areas of Reading were inhabited by members of both parties.

I thought that the sponsors of this project had shrewdly picked out the closest electoral situation in Pennsylvania at that time, and sought to affect the outcome of that election by selective registration. That was all I was pointing out.

I support the poverty program. I even agree, as my senior colleague knows, with many of his views on the poverty program. But I do not support making any part of this of political advantage to either political party.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I think the RECORD should show that there is no connection between the funding of the summer program of CAP in Reading, and the failure to fund a program up in McKean County. As I said before to my good friend

from California, I do not have any strong feelings about that.

If the Senator from California would withdraw his request for the yeas and nays on his amendment, I would be glad to accept his amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I should like to point out to my esteemed colleague that it is true that the example in Durham he and I cited was of a nonpartisan registration drive and election. The fact that disturbed me is that OEO volunteers showed marked ballots to the voters. This was an attempt to actually guide people in their voting and I object to this.

I would be glad to withdraw the request for the yeas and nays, if my colleague—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I must defer and yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CLARK. He is a tough customer. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amendment of the Senator from California is certainly meritorious. I think that the position of the Senate should be made clear that we are strongly against any such use of these funds for that purpose. Therefore, I would insist on a RECORD vote on this proposal. I think we should settle it definitely.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] to ask questions of the author of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I should like to ask the Senator from California a question or two on his amendment.

If a VISTA volunteer or a poverty worker is approached by individuals in the poverty area about how they can obtain their rights, or how they can exercise greater political power in an area, is there anything in the amendment that would prevent such VISTA volunteer or poverty worker from telling them to go out and register to vote?

Mr. MURPHY. Does the Senator mean in casual conversation with regard to that kind of information? For instance, if an individual said to the volunteer, "Do you know where I can go and register to vote?" or "Do you know where I could go and get some information for voting?" or "Where can I get a list of the candidates?"—that sort of activity. There is no objection to that, of course.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I understand.

Mr. MURPHY. The fault would be where paid employees of the OEO are sent out on a definite program to register voters. I think it is dangerous. I do not think we should divide the poor as between Democrats and Republicans regardless of which party happens to be in power. The poor should be treated in a bipartisan way.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I thought the Senator from California intended. Part of that which I expect the Senator from California would not object to is either a VISTA volunteer or a poverty worker urging people to go out and register and participate actively in the political life of their country; is that not correct?

Mr. MURPHY. Within the limitations of the amendment, of course, it would have to be decided. I have found, in my short experience in the Senate, that we write language and later on the legal staff of the department or bureau concerned tells us what the language actually means.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I thought, that the Senator from California might be able to work something out that would be acceptable.

Mr. MURPHY. I find myself at a disadvantage with the distinguished Senator from New York. He has had experience as Attorney General of the United States. So it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to enter into a dialog with him in order to establish this meaning. I think the Senator understands what I have in mind, and I am quite certain that the Senator is in agreement with me.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Right. I am not attempting to put words in the Senator's mouth, or to trap him. I have thought about what the intent of the Senator from California is. I thought that if there were activities in which VISTA volunteers or poverty workers might be involved, they should be able to look at this legislation and know whether they could be involved in any registration efforts at all. For example, what if someone came up to them and said, "What can we do to take a more active part in the political life of this country?" Can they answer, "Go ahead and register?" Or, in the course of conversation or work of VISTA volunteers or poverty workers, could they say, "Why don't you go out and register?"

Mr. MURPHY. So far as I am concerned it would be perfectly acceptable. This comes under the heading of personal rights.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is right.

Mr. MURPHY. There is no intention to invade those rights. This is merely a restriction on organized activity.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That is what I thought. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require to ask the Senator from California a question about his amendment.

As I understand it, all it does is prohibit the use of Federal funds to finance a registration drive by the OEO; is that not correct? It has nothing to do with what was developed in colloquy between the Senator from California and the Senator from New York just now, as to individual activities of employees so long as they are not being paid by the Federal Government, except to the extent that partisan political activity is already forbidden by the bill.

Mr. MURPHY. That is correct.

I have the feeling somehow—

Mr. CLARK. I am not trying to trap the Senator. Let that be written into the RECORD.

Mr. MURPHY. That never occurred to me. How could the Senator imagine such a thought on my part?

There are certain individual rights which the Senator from California would be the first to defend for all citizens. This amendment merely sets out a restriction for the Office of Economic Opportunity whereby it may not use funds that were taxpayers' dollars appropriated in the desire to help to set up voters' drives.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I regret the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is insisting on the yeas and nays after the sponsor of the amendment, the Senator from California, has been willing to withdraw them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I happen to be one of the sponsors of the amendment. The reason I insist on a record vote is that I think the Senate should be on record as being unalterably opposed to using Government funds to register voters or to pay workers on election day.

Mr. CLARK. I ask the Senator to speak on his own time, and not on mine. I suggest that he yield himself time on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have nothing further to say. The issue is clear. I am willing to get to a vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself the balance of my time and such time as I may require on the bill, on which there is an hour.

On behalf of the committee, I am not going to oppose the amendment. I shall advise my colleagues on this side of the aisle to vote for it if they see fit. I imagine most of them will.

To me, this amendment has none of the fierce spirit of righteousness which the Senator from Delaware, but not the Senator from California, has endeavored to give it. I hope, for the legislative record, it might be clear that this is a matter of relative insignificance which arose because 15 young people between the ages of 16 and 21 went out on the streets of Reading, as part of a summer program, for 1 month, to get people registered who were not registered. A number of people, in spite of the fact that the chairman of the county Republican committee had endorsed the project, felt this was a foul Democratic trick to get more Democrats registered for Reading. Nothing is further from the truth.

I could not get excited about the amendment. Nor do I think the practically unanimous vote which I am sure it will receive has any significance.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I suggest the amendment might have great significance. As the Senator knows, I am not too long in this distinguished body—

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has made a great record in a short time.

Mr. MURPHY. A successful vote, once in a while, for a member of the minority party would do much for his confidence and such a vote would cause me to do more in the service of my State and people. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if for no other reason than those stated by the Senator from California, for whom I have a deep affection and whose reputation in the Senate is growing day by day, and has now reached practically gigantic stature, I am glad to support the Senator from California on this vote. I hope the Senate will adopt his amendment by a smashing majority.

I am ready for a vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I want to point out to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I had not heard of the use of poverty funds to which he refers as having taken place in Pennsylvania, but I had heard about it in several other States. My attention had been called to this abuse as a result of registration drives in Tennessee, Michigan, and California. Today the Senate has an opportunity emphatically to put a stop to this by adopting the pending amendment. I certainly think it should be passed by a rollcall vote. I welcome the support of the Senator from Pennsylvania in this direction.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would warn the Senator that if he continues the debate he may change my mind. I suggest that we vote right now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought of that possibility just as I thought of the possibility that the Senator might change his mind in conference. That is why I insist on a record vote. If this amendment is rejected—and that is a possibility—let us get our positions on record. That is the reason I want the Senate to go on record as disapproving the spending of any Government funds to finance drives to register voters. I think we should settle the issue once and for all. That is the reason I welcome the support of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want the RECORD to show that there are more than the 15 people who were involved in the State of Pennsylvania—

Mr. CLARK. Reading—a very important city.

Mr. GRIFFIN. There are numerous places in the State of Michigan where this has been called to my attention. I have served, in both the House and the Senate, on committees that handled poverty legislation since it came into existence. It was always my understanding, and I think that of most Members of Congress, when we passed the legislation, that these funds would not be used for political purposes. These funds have

been used for political purposes. Whether we call them nonpartisan or anything else, it is for a political purpose.

The other day I met with people involved with the Neighborhood Youth Corps projects who told me how they had young people working last year. The question was asked, "What were they doing?" The answer was, "Well, we had them out registering voters."

I think this is the kind of thing that undermines the confidence of the American people in this whole poverty program. I have supported it. I just voted against an amendment to cut it back. But it is hard to explain it to the people back home and the voters when they say, "Yes, but look what they are spending the money for. They are not spending the money to train people in useful work, not for jobs in the future, but they are doing political work, registering voters, which does not train them for earning a livelihood."

True, it may help them in understanding something about citizenship, but this has always been done on a voluntary basis in our country. We do not pay people to become good citizens.

I hope that not only will the amendment be adopted but that it will be kept in the bill when the conference committee meets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been used or yielded back. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from California, offered for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator

from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 281 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Aiken	Griffin	Mondale
Allott	Gruening	Monroney
Anderson	Hansen	Montoya
Baker	Harris	Mundt
Bartlett	Hart	Murphy
Bayh	Hartke	Muskie
Bennett	Hatfield	Nelson
Bible	Hickenlooper	Pearson
Boggs	Holland	Pell
Brewster	Hollings	Percy
Burdick	Inouye	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Ribicoff
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Smathers
Church	Kennedy, Mass.	Smith
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Cooper	Kuchel	Spong
Cotton	Lausche	Stennis
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Symington
Dirksen	Long, La.	Thurmond
Dominick	Magnuson	Tower
Eastland	Mansfield	Tydings
Ellender	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Williams, Del.
Fannin	McGovern	Yarborough
Fong	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Metcalf	
Gore	Miller	

NAYS—3

Hayden	McCarthy	Morse
--------	----------	-------

NOT VOTING—12

Brooke	Hruska	Randolph
Carlson	Morton	Russell
Dodd	Moss	Talmadge
Hill	Pastore	Young, Ohio

So Mr. MURPHY's amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield myself such time as I need from the time allotted on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on September 28, 1967, appearing on page S13853 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which amendment was accepted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and agreed to by the Senate on that date, be changed to read as follows:

On page 118, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Persons serving as volunteers under this section or under section 821 shall provide such information concerning their qualifications including their ability to perform their assigned tasks and their integrity as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures, to the extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director requires under part A of this title. The Director may fix such procedures for the selection and approval of persons who are low-income residents of the area to be served by the project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title."

Mr. President, this change would direct that the amendment appear in a different section of the bill. As agreed to, as I understand it, the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky would apply only to the special so-called hometown VISTA volunteers. The change I am proposing would assure that the amendment apply to all VISTA volunteers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the

Senator from West Virginia state whose time is being used?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield. Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, would the Senator explain what his amendment would do?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky, as I understand it, would apply only to the special so-called hometown VISTA volunteers. My amendment would be applicable to all volunteers who are related to the VISTA program, regardless of capacity or length of service. It would apply to the full-time, all-year VISTA volunteers, as well as to the summer volunteers. I think that the able Senator from Kentucky is in favor of this, and intended that his amendment so apply. But it is my belief that his amendment did not do everything he intended. My amendment seeks to close the gap and cover those VISTA volunteers not covered by the amendment offered by the able Senator from Kentucky and adopted by the Senate.

I talked to a member of the Senator's staff and he indicated that the Senator would have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. I want to have an explanation of it stated in the RECORD.

Mr. President, may the amendment be stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 118, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) Persons serving as volunteers under this section or under section 821 shall provide such information concerning their qualifications including their ability to perform their assigned tasks and their integrity, as the Director shall prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures to the extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director requires under part A of this title. The Director may fix such procedures for the selection and approval of persons who are low income residents of the area to be served by the project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall tell the Senator and the Senate what my amendment proposed to do. If it did not accomplish that fully, I would like to have the Senator tell me.

My amendment arose from reports I had received from citizens in my State. In talks with the Director and people from the VISTA program of the OEO here in Washington, I found that they followed certain procedures in the selection of their volunteers.

I point out that I was informed there were several categories of volunteers.

The first were those that are recruited and selected by VISTA in Washington. I was informed that these volunteers were required to submit applications similar to those required of all civil service applicants, and were examined and processed accordingly.

I was further informed that where ap-

plications reported circumstances indicating a criminal record or subversive activities, the matter would be referred to the FBI before the application would be approved.

The purpose of my amendment was to reach all other volunteers. The second class of volunteers are those who are recruited by sponsoring organizations funded by OEO, such as the Appalachian volunteers. The Appalachian volunteers received a grant of some \$15 million. The Appalachian volunteers recruit individuals who perform services similar to those performed by the VISTA volunteers. But OEO told me that they could not say whether or not that type volunteer was required to prepare an application similar to the civil service applications required by VISTA and whether these applications were properly screened and reviewed.

My amendment was designed to reach them, by placing the responsibility on the Director, Mr. Shriver, through the Director of VISTA, to require the same application procedures and the same screening of applications and the same referral for FBI investigation, if appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky may proceed for 5 minutes, and that the time not be charged to either side on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I believe this is a rather important matter.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that the time be taken from the bill, because there is sufficient time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I modify my request, and ask that the time be taken from both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. My amendment would have placed the responsibility on Mr. Shriver and his delegate, the head of VISTA, to see that every organization that receives money from OEO and recruits volunteers shall require the same procedures of application and approval as are required in Washington.

There is one other group of volunteers. There are some volunteers recruited, say, in Kentucky or West Virginia or any other State, who do not have the educational qualifications that are required for regular VISTA volunteers. They are the low-income residents of the area to be served.

Of course, those men and women do not have the educational and work experience qualifications such as the regular volunteers have, and my amendment prescribed that the Director could establish special qualifications for them. That was the purpose of my amendment. It provided a means of assuring that these people had some qualifications, and had not engaged in criminal activities or subversive activities.

We had an unfortunate incident in Kentucky—involving the Appalachian volunteers who had employed a man named McSurley, who had been fired in Washington by OEO and was later fired by the Appalachian volunteers. He went

into eastern Kentucky, passing himself off as an Appalachian volunteer, and he used the name of Appalachian volunteers on his literature. I read this literature, not all of it, but a considerable part of it—and he was advocating the overthrow of the Government. Of course, people were outraged by this, because they thought he was on the payroll of the Federal Government in the poverty program. He was not then but he had been.

Activities such as these cause great trouble and dissatisfaction with the program.

My amendment was aimed at seeing that OEO had some responsibility in setting the qualifications and passing on and approving the people in this program. It is a good program. It brings into play the work and helpfulness and idealism of young people, but it should not be destroyed by the activities of a few destructive individuals, and I wanted some assurance that it will not be destroyed. That was the reason for my amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I believe the Senator has raised a very important point, one that has disturbed me from the outset—the matter of selection and screening.

I know that the purpose of the program is to pick up fellows who are in deep trouble, fellows who have had really bad backgrounds, to see if they can be straightened out, rehabilitated, and helped. But along the line there have been many instances of this sort of thing. Not long ago, in California, a group walked into the legislature with guns.

Mr. COOPER. I recall the incident.

Mr. MURPHY. With submachineguns. The leader of the group was at that time on the OEO payroll as a family counselor. He was later removed.

This sort of situation occurs continually, and I have become tired of saying, "Please, let us step up screening."

With respect to the Job Corps, I have objected to mixing hard-case, criminal types with some poor kids who just could not learn to read and therefore were dropouts at school. These really tough kids, tough guys, go in there and scare the other youngsters to death.

I have an amendment in the bill this year, which was agreed to, to set up a pilot program. These two ingredients should not be mixed; it is not proper.

I believe the Senator from Kentucky has made a very important point.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from California.

May I ask the Senator from West Virginia in what way his amendment would change the situation that I tried to reach by my amendment? Would it require the same strict qualifications for these poor people?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Kentucky and I see this matter almost alike. We want to get at the same aspect.

We have had problems in my State with some of the VISTA volunteers, and I am seeking to be sure that this amendment covers all the volunteers.

I should like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator's amendment cover the full-time, full-year volunteers?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I believe the Senator is mistaken. This is part of what I am trying to accomplish. I do not believe the Senator's amendment does that. I may be in error, but I do not believe it does that, and this is what I am seeking to do.

The Senator's amendment was only to section 820, paragraph (a), part (B), which deals with auxiliary and special volunteer programs. I believe the Senator desires to do what my amendment would do, but I do not believe his amendment carries out the purpose. My amendment directs itself also to VISTA volunteers covered in other sections and parts of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's contention is that my amendment covers those who are called VISTA volunteers, who make application and are approved by VISTA in Washington. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. COOPER. My amendment was drawn to include the categories of volunteers about whom I have been talking: the one employed in Washington, directly under the VISTA program, and the one employed by organizations funded by OEO.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But there are full-year volunteers and there are summer volunteers, both of which I feel are not covered by the distinguished Senator's amendment to which the Senate agreed a few days ago.

Mr. COOPER. I have no objection, except that I do not want the strict qualifications to apply to volunteers of the poor who could not meet the educational requirements. If the Senator can assure me that it does not apply to that group, I have no objection.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am advised by the subcommittee counsel that it would not.

Mr. COOPER. I will agree, on the grounds that the amendment will reach volunteers who are recruited by VISTA in Washington and recruited by organizations that are funded by OEO—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Such as Appalachian volunteers.

Mr. COOPER. But that it does not prescribe the same qualifications for volunteers who assist in menial chores. Then I agree.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have no desire to include that group.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have been advised by the subcommittee counsel that the amendment offered a few days ago by the able Senator from Kentucky and accepted by the Senate, does not reach the full-time, full-year volunteer, and does not reach the summer volunteer; and I believe the Senator joins with me in wanting these volunteers included.

Mr. COOPER. I want them. That is what my amendment intended.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is there an amendment pending at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is pending the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CLARK. I would suggest to my good friend from West Virginia that he withdraw his unanimous-consent request and propose an amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may I repeat my unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am concerned about the parliamentary procedure on this matter. I do not want to prolong the matter, but there has been objection made by the Senator that this is not a good way to legislate, and I agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent would be required for the Senate to strike the amendment which has already been agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am now informed that this amendment has again been submitted to legislative counsel, and it would achieve my purposes. I have no objection.

Mr. CLARK. For the RECORD, in view of this very unusual parliamentary situation, I shall not object to the unanimous-consent request because counsel for the subcommittee has discussed this amendment with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and find it entirely unobjectionable. I think it is perhaps a little peculiar way to legislate, but the parliamentarian said that it was all right, so I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request.

On behalf of the committee, I am prepared to accept the Byrd amendment to the Cooper amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to repeat my unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], at page 113, previously adopted, be deleted, and that I be permitted to offer another amendment to replace it at another point in the bill—

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, inasmuch as I proposed the measure, I hope the Senator will permit me to join therein.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. And that the Senator - from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] be joined as a cosponsor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is agreed to, and the suggested amendments are agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to confirm my understanding of the last amendment.

The amendment would be applicable to all volunteers who are related to the VISTA program, regardless of capacity or length of service. It would apply to full-time all-year VISTA workers as well as summer volunteers. It would require

that persons wishing to work in VISTA and related programs furnish to the Director evidence of their ability to perform the work in question as well as of their integrity. From this information the Director shall determine their suitability.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. That is my understanding of the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment on this issue?

Mr. CLARK. I yield time on the bill but could we get to third reading first?

Mr. President, there are no further amendments. Could we get to third reading?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield such time as he requires on the bill to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall only take a few minutes. I wish to address a question which relates to the volunteers and I would like to have the Senator's judgment about the question I am going to ask.

First, I ask if political activity on the part of volunteers is in any way restricted under the OEO program?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; there are strict restrictions against the activities which we wrote into the bill a year and a half ago.

Mr. COOPER. That is what I thought. I receive many complaints—and to be honest I do not know how accurate all of them are—that in Kentucky the volunteers are engaged in political activities. I know that can be interpreted in several ways. A person engaged in political activities could go out through the country and support or oppose candidates. Another type of political activity could be interpreted from their support or opposition to certain operations of government in that community.

I have talked to some of these volunteers. They were Appalachian volunteers and came to my office. They told me that they felt it was one of their duties to help the people who had been isolated, in rural and mountain areas, for such a long time. I know all of these people in these areas. I have been through all of these areas more than any VISTA volunteer ever will.

They told me that it is their duty to orient those people in political ways and to arouse their political consciences, so that they can form their own political judgments. They said flatly that to direct the attention of the people toward what they call "the establishment" or "the power structure" was one of their duties.

I, too, believe that people should have the opportunity to be better able to form judgments about political issues and even political candidates or officials. However, as a practical matter, it seems to me that the chief function of these volunteers, as it is of the poverty program, to try to correct the circumstances which have kept them down, economically, socially, culturally, educationally, and in many

other ways. I have thought that if these volunteers have the idea that their chief function is to arouse everybody politically, then their job is really not being done, because that is not the chief purpose of their job. I would be interested in knowing the Senator's position.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I support the position taken by the VISTA organization within the OEO, which has issued to each VISTA volunteer a handbook. I shall read from page 22 of that handbook under the title "Political Activities":

A. POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Because of recent amendments to our act, you as a VISTA Volunteer are now considered a Federal employee for purposes of the Hatch Act. As a result you may not engage in partisan political activities of any sort during your service. You may not assume a position of political leadership or become prominently identified with any political party or candidate. You may not publicly support or speak in behalf of or against a given political party or political candidate. You may, however, take positions in support of or opposition to the passage or repeal of laws and ordinances, and support or oppose issues which are not specifically identified with a political party or which are the subject of non-political elections, such as referendums, bond issues, constitutional amendments, or the like. You may participate in petitions and drives provided the petition is not associated with any political party or candidate.

Mr. COOPER. I understand generally the purpose of that language. Would the Senator consider that that section of the instructions for VISTA volunteers would approve and condone advice and suggestions to people to disobey the law?

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. COOPER. If these volunteers advise people to disobey the law would the Senator consider that they should be continued as volunteers?

Mr. CLARK. No. I think they should be dismissed.

Mr. COOPER. I asked the head of VISTA whether that was his position and he told me that it was and that it was the policy of VISTA not to condone volunteers advising people to disobey the law. Some of these activities have occurred and I want to condemn them. I believe that if VISTA volunteers advise people to disobey the law and to avoid the processes of law and government, then they should be fired.

One more question and I shall be through. This information came to me today from people in eastern Kentucky concerning the expenditure of certain Federal funds in eastern Kentucky. The chief source of income, perhaps, next to welfare, which is No. 2, is the coal industry. The coal industry has been improving in eastern Kentucky and, I am sure, in West Virginia, over the past 2 or 3 years. But, I am informed that 20-percent additional production could be assured and could be marketed if they had the men to work the mines.

Today, I talked to a group of people from Harlan County, and they told me that their coal production last year was 7,300,000 tons, but that production could be increased 20 percent; that is, by 1.5 million tons more, if they could find men to employ—150 to 350 additional miners.

I was told the reason they cannot find them is that there are no programs in the war on poverty or under the regular vocational programs to train men for jobs which are needed in the mining industry, such as handling, loading and cutting machines, and shuttle-car drivers, which pay up to \$24 a day and more. Yet, they cannot get the people to work in the mines.

I was further informed that, if there were adequate training programs, at least 2,000 or 3,000 more miners could be employed in eastern Kentucky right now, and at good wages.

Does the Senator in charge of the bill favor—if it is correct that there are no training programs for potential miners—the establishment of such programs?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. But, I think the Senator's question should be asked of the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz. That should be placed on his doorstep, to find out whether he does not have such programs under NDTA. I am surprised.

Mr. COOPER. This is the first time I had brought to my attention that there are no provisions for training programs for miners in the bill. Coal is still the greatest industry in this country. Would the Senator favor such a program?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. To train people for work in the mines, if such a program does not now exist?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I assume that I would. I do not know all the basic facts, as the Senator said he did not either. Therefore, I would want to find out whether there are any in the NDTA program.

If the Senator has been correctly informed, the answer to his question is "yes."

Mr. COOPER. I wish to say that I have just been given these facts this morning. I think it is worthy of investigation. I intend to make my own study and inquiry concerning this problem. Considering the importance of such a basic industry to our State's economy there should be programs to train people for employment in that industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have one question which I think has been corrected by regulations, but for the record I should like to point out that we had a situation in our State some time ago where an overenthusiastic group of workers of this agency were engaged in lobbying activities with the State legislature, recommending certain changes in the welfare program.

We reported that to the Washington office, and we were advised that there were regulations against it and that they had so notified these people in Wilmington. I think this problem has now been corrected, but for the legislative record I would ask the Senator this question: Is it correct that lobbying activities of such nature by such a group in a State legislature is strictly a lobbying activity and is forbidden?

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that the Senator is correct.

I hold in my hand a memorandum published by the community action program of OEO under date of June 10, 1967. It is entitled "Policy Guidance on Lobbying Activities." It is signed by Theodore M. Berry, director of the Community Action program. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY ACTION MEMO

Memorandum No. 66.

Date: June 10, 1967.

Subject: Policy Guidance on Lobbying Activities.

PURPOSE OF THIS MEMORANDUM

Many of the problems which cause or aggravate poverty are bound up with harsh or outmoded laws. Others can be most effectively attacked by the passage of new legislation. Community action is thus inevitably concerned with the shape of the laws which affect the poor.

On the other hand, there are necessarily very sharp limitations on the use of project funds by grantee and delegate agencies to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. Moreover, there are certain kinds of lobbying which interfere with the work of legislatures and thus impair the basic processes of democratic self-government.

The primary purpose of this memorandum is to identify essential restrictions on lobbying activities by grantees and delegate agencies that receive OEO funds under Titles II-A and III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act. The memorandum also serves as a reminder that under federal (and many state) tax laws, private non-profit agencies may endanger their capacity to receive tax-deductible contributions if they engage in substantial lobbying activities.

A. RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING WITH PROJECT FUNDS

Project funds may not be used to support any of the following:

1. Any activity which is planned and carried out in such a manner as to disrupt the orderly conduct of business by Congress or any other legislative body. This includes, but is not limited to, any disruptive action carried on in the chambers of Congress or any other legislative body or in any capitol or legislative office building.

2. Any demonstration, rally, picketing, or other form of direct action aimed at the family or home of a member of a legislative body for the purpose of influencing his actions as a member of that body.

3. Any campaign of advertising carried on through commercial media for the purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation.

4. Any campaign of letter writing, of other mass communications, or of mass visits to individual members of Congress or state legislatures for the purpose of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation. This restriction does not prohibit purely informational and educational activities involving target areas and groups.

These restrictions on use of project funds apply to federal and matching non-federal shares of approved program budgets under Titles II-A and III-B of the Economic Opportunity Act and include the use of equipment, material, and facilities and employee time and services which are either paid for with project funds or contributed to project funds.

These restrictions are not intended to limit the rights of individuals to express their personal views on public issues so long as they do so in their capacity as private citizens rather than employees. Nor are they intended to limit the freedom of local agencies to express their views on legislation so long as project funds are not used in violation of the foregoing limitations.

B. REMINDER CONCERNING TAX IMPLICATIONS OF LOBBYING

Under federal income, estate, and gift tax laws, gifts made to private non-profit organizations which devote a substantial part of their activities to carrying on propaganda or other activities aimed at influencing legislation, are not considered tax deductible "charitable contributions." This applies not only to federal and state legislation but also to the legislative actions of county and city councils and similar local bodies. Many state tax laws contain similar provisions.

In view of these tax laws, private non-profit grantee and delegate agencies should bear in mind that if they devote any substantial part of their activities to lobbying efforts, they may be endangering their ability to receive tax-deductible contributions. Such contributions may represent an important means of providing the non-federal share required in programs assisted under Section 204/205 of the Economic Opportunity Act. They also enable many local agencies to carry out other programs of assistance to the poor, apart from the Act.

There are no published rules defining what is meant under the federal tax laws by the term "substantial" lobbying activities. In cases of doubt local agencies should seek private tax counsel or contact the nearest field offices of the Internal Revenue Service and state tax authorities.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Part A of this memo is to take effect ten days from the official date of issuance shown above.

Part B of this memo merely serves as a reminder concerning existing law.

THEODORE M. BERRY,

Director, Community Action Program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. That was my understanding from my conversations with the department, that this lobbying activity was not permissible and that they have so advised the group. I have heard no further complaints from that area, but I thought it best to establish the record so that all would understand that this kind of operation is prohibited.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. How much time does the Senator from Ohio want?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Five minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently, when I was in Cleveland, I met with a delegation of women who had worked at one of the Job Corps centers in that city. They related to me conditions in one of the institutions which was allegedly helping the development of the ability of girls to get jobs and adjust themselves to life.

The story that was told to me I did not willingly accept. It was of a nature that caused great concern to me.

Subsequent to the meeting with those women, some of whom had been employees at the girls' institution, I received a letter from a lady who was connected with the institution but had left it and no longer lives in Ohio.

The letter reads:

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you about the Cleveland, Ohio Job Corp for girls, in hopes that something can be done before girls' lives are destroyed or corrupted before they can be educated.

My daughter enrolled in Job Corp and we were told what a wonderful place it was. When my daughter arrived in Cleveland, she then realized that the place was nothing like what she had been told. The article in *Glamour* that dealt with the Job Corps had not one picture nor illustration which is quite understandable for who would send their daughter to such a place if they knew what it truly was like.

We are a white family, but if we were Negro, I would still feel as I do now. I believe in equal rights for everyone, but I do not believe in inter-marriage nor inter-dating for my family.

The people who run Job Corps are trying to do a good job with what they have to work with. They are able to what is going on inside, but once the girls leave on a pass for the evening no one knows what is happening. During the few weeks that my daughter spent at the Job Corp Center, she met the most interesting people who live near the Job Corp Center. She met pimps, dope pushers, homosexuals of both sexes, and had an offer to become a prostitute at night after classes were over.

My daughter was more fortunate than some, because I had told all four of my children about sex, drugs, homosexuality, and their effect on an individual. I feel sorry for the girls who were never told and therefore had to find out the hard way—through experience.

We are not from a slum area, but if we were that doesn't mean I would want my daughter sent into another slum area and to be exposed to the happenings within a slum district. I brought my daughter home until something can be done to either relocate the Job Corp or until she can be transferred.

Thank you for reading my letter and I sincerely hope that with your influence something can be done about this deplorable happening within our United States. Surely you must agree with me when I say that no good can come from placing teenagers in a slum district to be educated. I, myself, fear the type of education they may be receiving.

That is about the end of the letter.

The charges made in this letter are more than substantiated by the women with whom I spoke in Cleveland and who were connected with this institution. The conditions about which complaint was made are that girls have been brought in from all over the country to the Cleveland area, from as far west as California. The complaint was also made that there was a program of developing socialization—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there is no time left.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield time to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of developing socialization. And so the enrollees of an institution in Pennsylvania are brought to Cleveland for a night or two nights of socialization, and then they go back home to where they came from.

I mention this matter today because it is one of grave importance, and the officials administering this program should give heed to what has happened.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we come now to the end of the road for Senate action on S. 2388, the bill to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act.

I want to thank all my colleagues in the Senate for their courtesy and consideration during the long and somewhat tedious process of considering this bill. It reached the Senate floor on September 22. Here we are on October 5, about to, I hope, pass it by a resounding majority.

I think it is a good bill. I regret very much that title II has been stricken, but whoever fights and runs away lives to fight another day, and we will be back on another day in reasonably short order.

I would like particularly to thank the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for his courteous consideration of all matters, sometimes in dispute, but always he dealt with them with the great degree of courtesy for which he is known.

I want to pay tribute to counsel for the subcommittee, William C. Smith, and to the director of the poverty study program, Howard W. Hallman, for the long and dedicated service they gave in preparing memorandums and their help in the many changes made in the bill.

I would like to pay tribute to Bob Patricelli, minority counsel for the subcommittee.

We could not have succeeded as we have without the splendid cooperation of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the other Members of the Senate who serve on the subcommittee, and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has had this bill in charge.

I am particularly grateful to the KENNEDY brothers from Massachusetts and New York for the splendid assistance they gave; to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]; to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL]; to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]; and to all the members of the subcommittee and the full committee.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has given us splendid cooperation in responding to inquiries. The staff of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, particularly Mr. Stewart McClure, chief clerk, and Mr. John Forsythe, counsel for the committee, have been most helpful, as have the staffs of Senators KENNEDY of New York, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and PROUTY of Vermont.

Finally, I would like to say I think the President of the United States sent us a good bill. I think we have improved it. I think there is nothing we have done which cannot be considered as an endorsement of what the President proposed, with some additional authorizations for new programs, which I believe the Senate and the committee were justified in putting into the bill.

I hope very much, if this bill is passed—and I hope it will be—we will be able to persuade our friends in the House of Representatives to accept the bill at least in major extent, so that in coming out of conference we can have a bill of which all Members of the Congress can be proud.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I want to commend my colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, for his conscientious efforts in presenting this legislation. I do not think there is any member of the committee who has not been impressed with the knowledge and the dedication of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Nobody has worked harder or with greater understanding of the problems involved than has the Senator from Pennsylvania. So I did not want this legislation to come to a final vote without acknowledgment of that fact.

I also want to say how impressed I have been with the work of the members of the staff of the committee.

Also, if I may take 15 more seconds, I would like to say what a pleasure it has been to work with the Republican members of the committee, who have been so conscientious, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who has always been present, and whose contributions to this legislation have been immense. They have been extremely impressive. The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], who is present on the floor, has also been most impressive and has contributed much to this legislation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, first of all, I would like to express appreciation to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], for his kindness in accepting the amendment sponsored by Senator COOPER and me.

Second, I want to congratulate him for his dedicated effort and hard work, and his fine presentation and managership of this bill. He has done a good job. I also express appreciation to the members of his staff who have been so cooperative with me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute to applaud the efforts of members of the committee on our side of the aisle, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. GRIFFIN. All have been remarkably assiduous in pursuing this work, and this "high rise" of hearing transcripts which graces every senatorial desk is probably the best tribute I know to the long and arduous labors involved in this bill.

At the same time, I salute the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], manager of the bill.

Now I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there is much merit in many of the programs in this bill, and I support many of them. However, I call attention to the fact that last year's authorization for this same program totaled only \$1.75 billion. The fiscal 1968 budget as submitted to the Congress asked that that amount be increased this year by \$310 million, or an increase of 17

percent, bringing the total to \$2.060 billion.

The Senate committee has added another \$198 million on top of the previous 17 percent increase. This bill's authorization is about 10 percent more than the amount requested by the Budget Bureau and more than they can efficiently use.

At some point the Senate is going to have to stop this continuous escalation of increased expenditures.

Even though I support individual programs in the bill but as one who feels we have reached that point, I shall vote against the bill, just as I voted against other proposals planning to increase expenditures far beyond last year's and also far beyond what the administration itself requested.

Certainly this Congress cannot, with all good intention, vote for these increases on individual programs and then, after all appropriation bills have been passed, expect to soothe their consciences by passing resolutions and passing the buck to the President by demanding he cut \$5 billion from the budget expenditures. We should have the courage to vote against such expenditures or be willing to accept our own responsibility.

Senate approval of this bill adds over \$500 million to last year's expenditures and around \$200 million above budget requests.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the bill before us now is the product of exhaustive study and careful thought. Under the sure leadership of its distinguished chairman [Mr. CLARK], the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty undertook a thorough examination of the war on poverty to see how the present Economic Opportunity Act is working and what legislative changes should be made. I think the subcommittee is to be especially commended for taking its hearings beyond the District of Columbia into nine States to gather the thoughts, criticisms, and recommendations of the people. I think S. 2388 reflects the sort of responsiveness, creativeness, and flexibility that good government demands and that the people of this country hope for.

One of the most important conclusions to be gleaned from the subcommittee's extensive study is that the incidence of poverty is still very much—indeed, too much—a part of the American picture. The Bureau of the Census recently released information revealing that "the number of U.S. residents with incomes below the poverty level decreased from 39 million to 30 million between 1959 and 1966." These figures indicate two things: First, we are making progress toward our goal of eliminating poverty in America, but, second, poverty continues to be a most serious national problem deserving high-priority attention. Even accepting the rather low poverty levels applied by the Census Bureau to their sample survey, something over 15 percent of our nearly 200 million citizens remain in the shadows of American abundance. Clearly there is much work to do, and recent history reveals the cost of neglect.

Mr. President, the amendments presently under consideration represent a

significant advance in the development of this Government's economic opportunity endeavor. Through them, our past experience in this field has been related to our present needs and actions. This bill contemplates both procedural and substantive changes which are designed to bring up to date the original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. If I may be allowed to generalize about the thorough revisions capably undertaken and set before us here, I think that there are two exceptionally fine threads of improvement woven throughout the fabric of these amendments: first, there is a very appropriate stress on local initiative and responsibility; second, there is established in practically every phase of this program the means for continuing evaluation of its operation.

Mr. President, I submit that the former improvement is essential to the success of this program, and that it might well be taken as a model for future governmental activities. It seems to me that one of the great needs with which government must cope is the need of an individual citizen to feel a positive relationship with his society and his government. I speak, Mr. President, of the Jeffersonian, Jacksonian, and Lincolnian concepts of government "by the people." In an age of bigness and complexity, I am afraid that too few are concerned with the little man, who finds himself drifting with no oar to grasp for steerage. In short, the individual is not personally involved and loses a sense of control over his destiny. We can and must begin to help him regain this control by positively involving him and, as this bill does, by placing an oar in his hands. I do not imply here, nor does this bill intend, any merely negative tearing down of big government; rather I am calling for a creative endeavor and flexibility, such as this bill provides, to respond to the very real needs of the individuals of this Nation.

Whether he is a farmer on poor land, a businessman in Dallas, or a Mexican-American laborer in San Antonio, these economic opportunity amendments place much of the initiative and responsibility in local hands. The focus is on community, neighborhood, and individual self-help. As the brief summary of S. 2388, prepared for the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, stated the intent of just one phase of the program:

The focus of such programs would be upon opportunity and self-help. The ultimate goal is to enable low-income persons to achieve self-sufficiency. In short, the community action program would move poor people through their own efforts into the mainstream of American life (Sec. 201).

The committee went on to conclude that—

Not only does local initiative need to be emphasized but also to be built into the processes of the community action program. Therefore, the bill contains a provision which seeks to balance the national interest and local initiative by reserving 50 percent of Title II funds for locally selected programs (Sec. 220(d)).

Mr. President, I am in total sympathy with this intent, and I commend and support the subcommittee's perceptiveness and their responsiveness to this need.

At the very least, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has been controversial and has stirred new thinking and creative ideas. I think these amendments are a worthy product of that controversy. If our skirmish with poverty has had failings, they have been largely failings of commitment. It seems undeniable that this Nation has not yet committed sufficient resources nor developed all the programs needed to eliminate poverty. The subcommittee has made one worthy response to this need by proposing the adoption of an Emergency Employment Act.

Mr. President, I endorse the general spirit and direction of the 1967 Economic Opportunity Act Amendments and the Emergency Employment Act, and I will speak to some of the specific provisions later.

Mr. PROUTY. I rise to state my support for the proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, as it appears that we are now approaching the vote on final passage.

The proposed legislation which we reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was, by and large, a good bill, and I believe that it has been materially strengthened by amendments which have been adopted on the floor of the Senate. Although I still have reservations in certain areas, the overall package to amend the poverty program is one which I can fully support.

Many important changes have been made in our commitment to fight poverty. However, I am convinced that my amendment calling for a truly representative, unbiased, and objective investigation for all the poverty programs on a national basis by the Comptroller General is the most important change we have made in this bill in terms of securing the long-range success of the war on poverty. The results of this investigation will provide a real basis for the sound evaluation of all these programs by the 91st Congress.

I have certain feelings of regret and disappointment, Mr. President, that the Senate did not see fit to adopt the Prouty-Scott substitute for the Emergency Employment Act. However, I would like to thank all my colleagues who supported our proposal for amending title II of the bill, and I am especially gratified by the substantial support which this amendment received from my fellow Republicans.

It is clear that the closeness of the vote on this amendment is indicative of the soundness of our approach, particularly when we take into consideration the administration's strong opposition to the Emergency Employment Act in any form.

If there is one significant fact which emerges from the debate of the last few days concerning enactment of an Emergency Employment Act, Mr. President, it is that, by our actions yesterday, we have merely postponed the time when programs such as these must be considered and acted upon in an affirmative manner. When that time arrives, and it must not be too far away, it is essential that we act constructively to insure that these programs train our poverty-afflicted citi-

zens for meaningful and productive jobs in the private sector of our economy where there are actual employment openings and opportunities.

As I have said before, I favor make work employment only to the extent that this type of program is necessary to provide employment for our disadvantaged poor who have reached a point in life where further education and training programs are incapable of permitting them to qualify for positions needed in private enterprise.

Finally, Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, the Senior Senator from Pennsylvania, for his willingness to consider my amendment on its merits and for his subsequent support. In addition I want to express my personal appreciation for the long hours of hard work put in on this bill by both my Republican and Democratic colleagues on the full committee.

Finally I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Bill Smith and Howard Hallman, of the majority staff, and Robert Patricelli and Peter Benedict, of the minority staff, for their hard work on this bill. I also appreciated the able assistance of Richard Murphy, from the staff of Senator HUGH SCOTT, and Eugene Jenkins, Arthur Dufresne, Mary Hoag, Paul Molloy, Betty Collins, Margaret Blackstone, and Suzan O'Neil from my own staff.

Again, Mr. President, I think all my colleagues who supported my emergency employment amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to take 15 seconds of my time to thank the Senator from Vermont for his kind words, and to express my appreciation of the cooperation we achieved together in our unsuccessful but nonetheless significant efforts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in connection with the Senate's continuing discussion of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excellent report which appeared in the Nashville News on August 11, 1967, on the success of an Operation Headstart program in Nashville, Ark.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADSTART SUCCESS OPENS NEW WORLD TO YOUNGSTERS

A whole new world—bright with challenge and promising better health and education—opened this Summer for some 142 pre-school children, mostly from lower income families.

And closed Friday with the promise fulfilled.

Operation Headstart, under the aegis of the Office of Economic Opportunity, provided for the underprivileged just what the name predicted, a jump into the school world and a better chance to avoid dropout status and the entrapment of minimum reward for unskilled adult labor later.

Nashville's Headstart program for 124 of those children came off as a striking example of the willingness of white and Negro races to face a 20th century challenge with respect for others.

The last two weeks of Headstart, with its special trip to Hope and a picnic at the

fair ground, was in startling contrast to violent events elsewhere in nation undergoing integration.

Teachers and officials are all in agreement. Headstart worked, and proved itself of value.

Youngsters were divided. There were about 10 more white children than Negroes in the 124 attending Headstart classes at Nashville's elementary building during the eight weeks. Absenteeism was rare. Parents often came with their children just to observe, and went away, pleased according to Mr. Herman Stavelly, county director for Headstart. She directed the Nashville and Dierks schools.

Teachers and aides were both white and Negro. There were seven teachers and seven aides, including two Negro teachers, four Negro aides and one Negro social worker.

Little was overlooked in the program for the 5 and 6-year oldsters who will enter their first classroom this Fall. It all began with health.

Mrs. Stavelly said that every child was given a thorough examination. That included eyes, ears, nose, teeth and heart. A tubercular test showed four positive and they received second x-rays. The child needing dental care was given up to \$40 from federal funds for that work. Federal funds paid the doctors who gave physical examinations.

New state laws requiring five inoculations prior to school days were followed. The county health nurse gave most children their required five shots.

Food was provided. Children received a mid-morning snack. Usually this was fruit, crackers or cookies and milk. "Some of the children rode the bus without any breakfast," the teachers learned. The US provided 40c per day for the food, and the noon meal was served without charge.

Primarily the children were introduced to the world of knowledge.

The kindergarten program provided educational materials such as blocks, flash cards, picture number information, art work, and even music. A rhythm band was formed and homemade instruments put to play.

"A big change was noticed in the children after the first week," one classroom teacher said.

The objectives of classroom work were varied. One teacher listed these:

1. To help children adjust socially and physically;
2. To give them an insight to education via instruction;
3. To teach the child discipline;
4. To improve eating habits and food selection.

Teachers were unanimous in giving a high rating to Headstart here.

Here is what one teacher from the Tollette faculty had to say: "The children seemed to adjust alright. They liked the play period, they liked art work."

She recalled that early in the schooling one little girl cried to return home with her mother. No more. She conquered her fears and had no problems.

Headstart, she said, was quite a help to children. "They adjusted to other people, and I enjoyed working in the integrated situation. I certainly hope Headstart is continued."

Mineral Springs furnished a teacher for the faculty. She too praised the program.

She had 18 in her Headstart class and her estimate of the program:

Attendance was good, most of the children didn't miss a day;

There was improvement from every child;

Visitors were amazed at the improved ability of children to communicate;

Food? One little girl had never seen celery.

This teacher compared a pupil with an older brother who is a likely drop-out. The boy knew little about school but a lot about profanity. That changed, and he isn't the potential drop-out his brother is.

"The youngest boy is starting almost on an equal footing with other children, and

this is good. Otherwise he would be held back and this would be expensive to taxpayers as well as lead to a social problem," she commented.

At their innocent ages, they knew no color lines.

"There just was no color difference," one white teacher noted. "They are just children. If they find another boy who wants to play cowboy, he doesn't care if he's polka dot. They are too busy to be conscious of racial differences."

Teacher rapport was the same. "There was no difference in teacher-pupil relationship because of race."

One teacher pointed out that "the white students had a great need too."

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, for very good reasons, I cannot support S. 2388, the proposed Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. I only wish I could do otherwise—and do so with the conviction that I would be helping to improve the lot of the many Americans who do need help to break through the barrier of poverty.

I realize, as presumably does each Senator who will cast a similar ballot, that a vote against the so-called antipoverty bill will in some instances be interpreted as a vote for poverty. And that is precisely the conclusion many supporters of the measure hope Americans will draw. Nothing would please them more than to tar-and-feather us with the stigma that we are unsympathetic with the plight of the economically disadvantaged, or that we are indifferent to the Nation's needs. Very well. But that certainly is not the truth. Almost to a man, we have supported, and will continue to support, every realistic antipoverty measure, whether in the field of education, health or welfare. But this bill, S. 2388, is not realistic—and primarily because it is based on a false assumption, namely that our problems are wholly economic. They are not. But even if they were, even if the Government now had the money to fight costly wars on two fronts, even if public spending were superior to private investment in solving these problems—even if you assume all these things, what reason is there for believing that we can buy our way out of poverty. Certainly, the present poverty program does not warrant such confidence, such hope. At best, with the exception of Headstart, it has achieved only mediocre success. And even that has been expensively purchased.

Therefore, what we object to in the antipoverty program is not its aim, which we also share, but its excesses, its failures, its unfulfilled dreams—and the frustrations they in turn produce. Specifically, what I object to in the program are its high administrative costs; its paying for programs that encourage one group of Americans to hate other Americans; its reliance on measures that are throwbacks to a depression era; its practice of ignoring and bypassing State and locally elected officials; and its almost total exclusion of the resources that private industry could bring to bear.

Furthermore, there is no logical reason why many of the new poverty programs cannot be funded through and administered by existing Federal agencies. Why must we forever establish new bureaus, new sections, to deal with problems and programs that clearly are within the

province of a functioning agency, whether it is HEW or HUD or whichever? The practice produces great duplication and waste.

Another concern, of course, is whether we—whether taxpayers—can afford so expensive a program, at least now when our spending for national defense is at such a high level. State and local taxes have been increased throughout the Nation, social security taxes soon will be raised, the administration is urging a 10-percent surtax—where will it end? How much of a burden must the average taxpayer be asked to shoulder? How much can he shoulder? The only thing we can accomplish by this foolishness is not to raise the poor out of the depths of poverty, but rather to tax countless more Americans, those who work and pay a large share of the costs of government, into that position. We must find the moral courage to admit that we cannot afford to do everything at once, no matter how much we might think it needs doing. We cannot purchase instant affluence.

We must find an answer to the problems of poverty, Mr. President. But this bill is not it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at this time when the poverty program in America is coming under attack from all sides for its failures in some instances and its cost in all instances, a very timely study has been reported by the Wall Street Journal of the pockets of poverty, where people remain desperate and starving. As noted in this article of October 3, "The problem is how to break the cycle of deprivation." And only slowly is this cycle being broken, through education and training for the children, through decent living conditions provided for the families.

This very thorough study goes from the "dogpatch" areas of south and west to "Uptown" Chicago where thousands of poor Southern whites have been stalemated in their search for self-betterment in the more prosperous north. Everywhere are found those characteristics which make poverty self-perpetuating—poor education, poor health, and, an important quality which the article points out, "almost uniformly, they lack political muscle." Time and again, throughout this article, it is pointed out that local officials do not help and do not care to help in the solving of local poverty problems. It is such an attitude that the poverty workers must fight in localities throughout America, and it is such an attitude that we in Washington who care must fight if headway is to be made.

Standing out in my reading of the article, "Living in Poverty," was a short review of the situation in Starr and Hidalgo Counties in Texas:

Poverty workers are desperate. "Officials don't believe it," says one volunteer. "They say we're only pointing out the exceptional cases. But people are literally starving to death here."

And bear in mind that these very people are presently faced with the new difficulties of Hurricane Beulah and her aftermath—are homeless, helpless, and without jobs, for the crops which most of them pick for a living are wiped out.

Mentioned are the efforts of a great man, Mayor Leo J. Leo of La Joya, Tex., whom I know well, to find a program which would assist these people. I insist, as he does, that something must be done here, for in Texas, where more people live below the poverty level than in any other State, where child welfare payments are the lowest in the Nation, there is not yet even a State minimum wage law. The situation is urgent.

I commend the Wall Street Journal on the concern shown in this article, and by this excellent reporting of a condition which America cannot ignore. Perhaps these reports should read, "Thousands of people lost today in the war against poverty—lost to starvation, to lack of medical treatment, to unsanitary conditions, to unheated tenements, to poor skills and low pay." Perhaps then our consciences would demand that these lives and these people be saved.

Today we in the Senate have an opportunity to show our interest and concern, in the passage of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967, S. 2388. In our Nation something must be done about poverty, and we must remain alert to the necessity of congressional action and interest, without which the greatest war of our times would be lost.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the October Wall Street Journal, "Living in Poverty: How Some People Exist at the Bottom of the Economic Ladder," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 1967]

LIVING IN POVERTY: HOW SOME AMERICANS SCRAPE BY AT BOTTOM OF ECONOMIC LADDER—SOUTHERN WHITES IN CHICAGO, ARIZONA INDIANS, ESKIMOS SHARE COMMON PROBLEMS—JUST A DEAD MAN WALKING

The five of Mrs. Lillie Harrison's 14 children who still live at home, in rural Madison County, Miss., have never talked on a telephone, been to a movie or ridden a bicycle. The Negro family gets \$66 worth of food stamps a month, enough for two meals a day.

John Seczizinski, 76, gets old age assistance of \$104 a month. It buys a plate of stew each day and covers the rent on his 12-foot-by-7-foot room in a north Philadelphia flop-house. But, clad in a sweat-stained undershirt and rumpled trousers, he looks up bleakly and says, "The living isn't so good. Sometimes I just sit down and cry."

Twinsburg Heights, Ohio, isn't far from a number of affluent suburbs, and a tall water storage tower belonging to Chrysler Corp. looms within view. But this enclave of Negroes outside Cleveland has neither water nor sewage facilities, and the residents make do with wells and outhouses.

In a migrant labor camp outside Stockton, Calif., William Burns stretches out on a thin, soiled pallet in the single males' barracks. Food and lodgings cost \$1.75 a day, and contractors charge \$1 or \$2 a day for the privilege of working. Even in the best of times, when the tomato crop comes in, Mr. Burns seldom makes much more than expenses.

HIDDEN POVERTY

That some Americans live in poverty has been public knowledge for some time, of course, and lately more than ever. Bloody riots have pinpointed deprivations in the big city ghettos, and a Senate subcommittee recently heard testimony that displaced share-

croppers in Mississippi were starving. But Wall Street Journal reporters around the country find that there still exist pockets of poverty scarcely noticed by society, let alone attacked, although the "war" on poverty officially is three years old. For some families in these localities, the \$3,000 annual income generally recognized as reaching the poverty barrier would be a fortune.

Between Independence and Kansas City, Mo., for instance, is a dreary "Dogpatch" city of wooden shacks that is disowned by both municipalities; most residents are unemployed. On a Passamaquoddy Indian reservation in Washington County, Maine, unemployment is 97%. Up to 13 persons sleep in one room at the Gallardo labor camp in Stanislaus County, Calif. Among the poorly housed Eskimos in the hinterlands of southwest Alaska, the average life span is 34.3 years.

The catalogue of difficulties among the people at the very bottom of the economic heap—poor nutrition and housing, inadequate medical and dental care, menial jobs or none, and a prevailing lack of hope—tends to be perpetuated when their children don't finish school, as is often the case. Although antipoverty programs are making inroads in some areas, some of the very poor are beyond the reach of social programs, too suspicious or proud to ask for help, ignorant of their rights or simply apathetic. Almost uniformly, they lack political muscle.

DISBELIEVING OFFICIALS

All the problems are on view among the Mexican-American farm workers in Starr and Hidalgo Counties, Texas, in the Rio Grande valley, and local poverty workers are desperate. "Officials don't believe it," says one volunteer. "They say we're only pointing out the exceptional cases. But people are literally starving to death here."

A survey by the Starr County antipoverty program of several impoverished communities showed 71% of 3,339 families with annual incomes of less than \$3,000. About 1,000 of those families had incomes below \$1,000. Only 4% of children 14 and 15 years old still were in school, and 90% of the men over 14 were unemployed.

The problem is how to break the cycle of deprivation. In the one-room shack of Carlos Ramirez, in La Joya, in Hidalgo County, three generations of poverty are represented. Mr. Ramirez, 70, became a widower two years ago. The chief income for himself, four of his children who usually are at home and a six-year-old granddaughter, is \$94 a month in state welfare. Lately this has been supplemented by \$50 a month sent from an Idaho Job Corps camp by Carlos Jr., 19.

Carlos Jr. left school after the third grade. Julia Anne, 26, has a fifth grade education. Last summer she worked hoeing cabbage on a truck farm. Otella, 22, who was burned badly in a kerosene fire several years ago, still lives in the 12-foot-by-20-foot shack. Juan, 16, has a fourth grade education. Dominga, the granddaughter, was left at the shack by her parents five years ago and never retrieved.

DIFFERENT BUT THE SAME

Equally resistant, although 1,200 miles distant, are the problems of a poverty pocket in metropolitan Chicago. Much has been said about the migration of Southern Negroes to Northern Cities, but little of migration north by Southern whites. "Uptown," a 120-square-block section five miles north of downtown Chicago, contains about 33,000 poor whites from the rural South.

They came from economically depressed areas to make a new start. But Uptown, the port of entry, tends to become the last stop. "You never have enough to get ahead," says one resident. "It takes all your income just to live." An Office of Economic Opportunity study showed that 51% of heads of households either were unemployed or had jobs that paid less than \$3,000 a year.

The men get day labor or other short-lived

jobs, and the families live in tiny furnished apartments, with the rent paid weekly. A 14-year-old from Tennessee says his father made \$35 in the first week in Uptown; \$20 went for rent, leaving only \$15 to cover other expenses for their family of eight.

The newcomers can't adjust to big city life, social workers say. Some aren't sufficiently literate to fill out an employment application. Others are frightened of such big city appurtenances as buses. An Uptown resident of 10 years standing, one poverty worker says, is still likely to list his residence as "Pike County, Ky."

Services to help them are meager. "Southern whites have no Martin Luther King or Stokely Carmichael," notes Tom Nolan of the Catholic Poverty Committee. Another social worker says: "They get the crumbs of the relief pie." Welfare officials also say the Southern whites often are too proud to ask for help. Typically, a Tennessee mother who finally did go on relief complains: "They question you to death."

Amidst such difficulties, why do they come north? A poverty official who has visited eastern Kentucky, a prime source of Uptown immigrants, says, "Sure, slums in Chicago are bad, dirty and depressing. But a kid can bust out if he's sharp and lucky. Down there it's utterly hopeless. People live in shacks and sit around with blank looks on their faces."

But life in Uptown is poorly geared to "busting out." Changes of residence are so frequent, school officials say, that one grade school reports annual student turnover of 150%. One girl had moved 23 times before her 13th birthday. And education officials say parents are prone to take their children out of school frequently for visits to relatives or to help around the household for a few weeks.

HARD-CORE APPALACHIA

The poverty worker's assessment of Appalachia would seem to be borne out by the Mark B. Smith family in Cremona, Ky. "I'm just a dead man walkin'," says Mr. Smith. Once a coal miner and construction worker, he hasn't been able to work since 1965.

Mr. Smith's disabilities, ranging from back injuries to a nervous condition, don't qualify him for public assistance. He, his wife Clara, and their six shoeless children subsist on a Salvation Army stipend which allows purchase of food stamps worth \$82 each month.

The Smiths had a four-room shack, but it burned down during the summer, and they now live with his mother. His children, aged 16 months to 17 years, use pebbles and twigs as makeshift toys while Mr. Smith, thin and unshaven, says, "About the future? I just couldn't tell you. If something doesn't turn up soon, it's a hopeless case."

Poverty workers in the area are stymied. Antipoverty programs, they say, don't get the needed cooperation from local officials or the poor. Edwin J. Safford, director of an OEO community action program, bemoans what he considers meager antipoverty resources and says, "There's no answer for this area until new industry moves in." But, he adds, there is little to attract industrial investment.

Other poverty workers assail what they consider a lack of concern for the Appalachian indigents. "How do you compete with riots in the cities?" asks an OEO volunteer. At a recent meeting of unemployed men at the abandoned mine workers' union meeting hall in Hazard, Ky., a wife rose, and shaking her fist said, "You men oughta go marching like niggers, and tear everything to hell as you go."

A POLITICAL ORPHAN

Another kind of political impotence blights life in Twinsburg Heights, Ohio, a curious community of 200 Negro families that has no government. Seventeen miles from both Cleveland and Akron, it is a backwater amidst explosive urban and suburban growth (there

are at least seven such poverty pockets in Ohio, social workers say).

Technically, the Heights is part of Twinsburg Township, but the 1,200 Negro residents say they have been excluded from representation in local government. Although water lines from both Cleveland and Akron run nearby, the Heights has no water system. Twinsburg Township zoning restrictions forbid commercial establishments, residents say, preventing development of local businesses.

"Most people are apathetic and indifferent," a poverty worker says. In the Heights, crumbling homes occupy tiny plots along dirt streets with no sidewalks. Nearly 40% of the adults don't have an eighth grade education. Their children attend a nearby suburban school, but a social worker says, "There is a stigma attached to the children of the Heights that can't help but affect their school work and outlook on life." Other children make fun of the outhouses in the Heights.

The mold was cast in the 1920s when a real estate developer bought farm land, subdivided it and sold to Negroes, over the objections of local residents. Politically and psychologically, the Heights has been an orphan ever since, and the Negroes are convinced other communities would like to ease them out to make way for industry. "It is a poverty of the spirit more than economic," a social worker thinks.

THE ELDERLY

A poverty of the spirit perhaps even more desolating afflicts the indigent elderly, like Mr. Seczizinski, the man who leads a flop-house existence in north Philadelphia. The 76-year-old Mr. Seczizinski, who came to this country from Poland in 1912, has no friends or relatives.

A large wall clock ticks oppressively in Mr. Seczizinski's room, and a single light bulb hangs on a cord from the ceiling. The linoleum on the floor is wearing thin, and the walls are stained by steam from exposed pipes. The furniture includes four straight chairs, a small bed and a sink.

Rent takes \$35 of his \$104 monthly income. When other necessities are subtracted, he has about \$1 a day for food. Mr. Seczizinski occupies his time wandering about the Market Street area or listening to his small transistor radio.

Mrs. Effie Stokes, a 71-year-old Negro widow who lives about 10 blocks from Mr. Seczizinski, has the same income but remains resolutely cheerful and active. She budgets carefully, but coal bills in winter throw her finances out of kilter. When the money runs out, she sifts the ashes for unburned lumps. "You have to know how to make things last," she says.

POOR MEDICAL CARE

Mrs. Stokes and Mr. Seczizinski share with many of the poor an aversion to doctors and dentists, often found even when they are eligible for Medicare or other help. "I don't go to see no doctor," he says, although he speaks of rheumatism in his legs. Mrs. Stokes says, "I can't recall the last time I've been to a doctor." Nor does she have a dentist. When her teeth hurt, "I rub salt on them and swab them with alcohol. This helps for a while."

Welfare officials can't explain this attitude. A spokesman for the Philadelphia County Board of Assistance says it will pay medical bills for such persons over 65 years of age if the treatment is essential. But many doctors won't accept the Board's \$4 payment for an office call. And nursing homes are reluctant to take elderly indigents, for whom the Board will pay only \$225 a month.

Other poverty pocket families are equally lacking in medical and dental care. In the Mexican-American town of Lariat, Colo., Richard Naranjo, 13, concedes that he never has brushed his teeth. Dr. William Bradley, a physician who has opened a clinic to help

Lariat's abode dwellers, talks sadly of untreated cases of hepatitis, dysentery, encephalitis and syphilis. "What can you do when the ambulance to Denver costs \$125?" he asks. "The medical profession is defeated because there is nothing we can do."

TB AMONG THE ESKIMOS

In the impoverished Hinsdale County area of southern Colorado, there is no hospital. The Dogpatch area between Independence and Kansas City doesn't get public health services from either city. Emil Notti, an Eskimo leader, says 80% of Eskimo children in remote sections of Alaska have active tuberculosis, but few get treatment.

In some poverty pockets, health is being improved. The 2.8 million-acre reservation of the Papago Indians, in the mesquite and cactus-studded Sonoran desert of Arizona, got a 50-bed hospital in 1961, erected by the U.S. Public Health Service. Now 80% of the reservation's babies are born in the hospital, and infant mortality, which was 60 per 1,000 live births in 1955, has declined to about 40 per 1,000 (the national average is about 25 per 1,000).

The USPHS says also that half the Indians now have adequate water and waste disposal facilities, compared with 10% in 1955. But the life span of the Papago still is in the low 40s, at least 20 years less than that of the general population.

The panoply of Federal OEO programs, augmented by local welfare efforts and initiatives by some religious groups, is showing tentative results in some poverty pockets. In Twinsburg Heights, 30 Negro children are in a preschool Head Start program, and 23 teen-agers are in Upward Bound classes at nearby colleges, hopefully in preparation for higher education.

FORMER NUNS HELP

The OEO has brought preschool, parent-child and remedial reading programs to the Papago Indians, along with instruction in legal aid, community development and youth opportunity. In Chicago's Uptown, former Catholic nuns who left the Glenmary order and formed their own group are winning the confidence of the Southern white migrants.

But social workers complain elsewhere of a lack of funds, of disinterest among local governments and of an inability to overcome deep-seated problems. Peter Louwerys, director of the Farm Workers Opportunity Committee of the American Friends Service Committee, says antipoverty programs haven't measurably bettered living standards of agricultural workers in California.

In Detroit, welfare officials note that a year's residency is necessary to become eligible for relief, and then a migrant has to produce birth certificates for each member of his family. Employers often demand birth certificates, too. In the case of immigrating Negroes, this means a request to a Southern county courthouse. "They're not too anxious to help us," one welfare official says.

In the village of Abram, in Hidalgo County, Texas, the Vega family lives on about \$800 a year, the amount daughter Adela, 37, makes on citrus and vegetable farms. Juanita, 22, is a polio victim. Their 56-year-old mother is a widow. Leo J. Leo, mayor of nearby La Joya and a sort of unofficial one-man war on poverty, can't find a single public assistance program for which the family qualifies.

"If ever there was poverty, these people have it," he says heatedly. "My God, something should be done."

DO THINGS COST MORE?

Among the poor, a common complaint is economic exploitation. Mrs. G., a Negro mother who lives in the Detroit ghetto, claims the local supermarket raised prices sharply after this summer's riots (although the city passed, and enforced, an antigouging ordinance). "They wanted \$1.78 for a package of six neckbones," she says. "Everything was really high."

The California Farm Labor Office says migrant farm workers get an average wage of \$1.40 an hour, but Tom Williams, vice chairman of an OEO program in Ventura County, reads a different story into check stubs supplied by the workers. One man, he says, got \$10.37 for nine hours of lemon picking. But after a local growers' association deducted for transportation, glove rental, housing and other matters, net income for the day was \$1.12. Such cases aren't unusual, he says.

The poor and uneducated may be vulnerable through lack of information. In Lariat, Colo., a worker for VISTA, the domestic Peace Corps, says Spanish-speaking residents are making instalment payments they can't afford at exorbitantly high interest. "People are signing contracts they don't understand," he says.

Like anyone else, the poor person has extravagances, too. Mrs. Lillie Harrison and her five children in Madison County, Miss., have an income of only \$75 monthly, in the form of two relief checks. But this spring she squandered almost 7% of the annual income on her daughter Lena Pearl—\$28 for a peach-colored party dress for a school dance and \$32.60 more for a class ring. But it was a symbolic event. Lena Pearl probably will be the first of her 14 children to graduate from high school.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have been critical of some aspects of the antipoverty program. At the same time, however, I have expressed support for other aspects thereof. I want, as much as anyone, to help the poor, especially those persons who will try to help themselves.

As we now approach the final vote on the bill before us, I would have preferred to see the Senate reduce title I by \$198 million so as to make the authorization for that title conform to the administration's request. I voted for the Williams amendment which would have brought about a reduction in the title I authorization, but that amendment was defeated.

Nevertheless, in view of the Senate vote on yesterday deleting title II, and thus eliminating the authorization therein amounting to \$2.8 billion, and in view of other refinements which have been made during floor debate, I am willing now to vote for the bill. I supported the amendment by Senator PROUTY, which was adopted, to require a thorough investigation of the poverty programs by the General Accounting Office. Moreover, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has accepted the amendment which Senator COOPER and I cosponsored to place tighter restrictions and controls over the selection and activities of VISTA volunteers.

Without these improvements which have been made on the Senate floor, and without the deletion of title II, which would have authorized an additional \$2.8 billion, I could not have voted for the bill on final passage.

I hope that the Office of Economic Opportunity will exercise greater care in, and control over, the selection and activities of poverty workers so as to avoid, in the future, some of the criticism which I and others have voiced.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 2388, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967.

I believe that the bill as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with the committee amendments

together with the amendments that were adopted on the floor will make for an improved bill.

I believe that these amendments will insure certain procedures and safeguards necessary to make the poverty program more effective and responsive to the efforts of our communities in assisting the poor.

In voting for final passage, I am pleased to note that the manager of the bill [Mr. CLARK] accepted four of my amendments which I called up on September 28, and which are incorporated in the final text of the bill. The main thrust of my amendments is to provide for greater participation and responsibilities in the poverty program at the State and community levels and to establish procedures for the selection of applicants serving as volunteers in the VISTA programs where no procedures exist today.

First, the present law provides that the assignment of VISTA volunteers shall be under such terms and conditions as the director may determine but volunteers shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without the consent of the Governor.

Where an assignment of volunteers has been consented to by the Governor and, at a subsequent time, he does not feel that the volunteers are carrying out their duties in the best interests of the program the present law does not specifically authorize the Governor to request the withdrawal of such volunteers. I have been informed by the Office of Economic Opportunity that in the absence of explicit statutory authorization it is the policy of the agency to withdraw volunteers at any time at the request of the Governor. My amendment would write this policy into the bill so as to avoid any misunderstanding as to the individual responsibilities of the Governor and the Director.

My second amendment requires that the chief elected official or officials of a community have the opportunity to serve on their community action board and if such official desires not to serve, to designate a person to serve in his place. In addition, the amendment specifically provides for membership on community action boards of representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

It is my belief that if community action programs are to be successful the support of all the community is necessary, not only its private citizens and organizations, but the governing officials of the community, as well. Further, it is necessary to mobilize local resources, including funds, and, we would hope, the abilities and capacities of the community's officials.

The language of the reported bill provided that in assisting in the provision of legal services to the poor, the director shall make arrangements with the principal bar associations in the area. A third amendment I introduced provided that, in addition, they shall seek the advice and comments of the State bar association. I believe that State bar associations are more broadly based, and they

usually have a staff which is better able to provide helpful assistance.

My last amendment requires that the Director of OEO employ the same procedures and information of all volunteer applicants in the VISTA programs as is required of those who are selected as representatives of VISTA. In securing its applicants to serve as volunteers in its programs VISTA uses application forms substantially the same as those used by the civil service. Where such applications reveal circumstances indicating criminal activities, subversive activities or other forms of misconduct, VISTA then refers the application to the FBI for further investigation.

However, with respect to volunteers who are selected by other agencies funded by OEO, there are no similar procedures or requirements. For example, the Appalachian volunteers have received several million dollars from OEO, but as far as OEO is aware the Appalachian volunteers has no procedures to screen and select their applications, and the Director of OEO has no control over their selection or approval.

My amendment would make applicable to all categories of volunteers the same procedures so as to assure the selection of persons with proper qualifications and good character. At the same time, my amendment would authorize the Director to prescribe other qualifications for those volunteers selected from the poor and low-income residents of the area to be served who cannot meet the educational qualifications of the VISTA applicants.

Today, Senator BYRD, by unanimous consent, introduced an amendment to my amendment which I agreed to and was accepted by the manager of the bill [Mr. CLARK] which makes certain that these procedures apply to volunteers in all of the VISTA title programs.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to an amendment I offered in committee to the Job Corps section of S. 2388. This amendment is incorporated in section 113(c). The amendment provides for the establishment and the operation of a model combination vocational school and skill center. The center will be located in an urban area having a high dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths and a need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill center. The amendment will attempt to "determine whether upgraded vocational education schools could eliminate or substantially reduce the school dropout problem and to demonstrate how communities could make maximum utilization of expensive educational and training facilities."

The assigned task of the center will be to prevent or reduce the dropout rate of the area schools and secondly, to train those in the community who have previously dropped out of school or who are in need of remedial education and training. Under the amendment, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in cooperation with the Commissioner of Education, will enter into one or more agreements with State educational agencies to pay for the establishment and the operation of such centers.

The amendment requires that any agreement entered into contain provisions to assure that, first, a job survey be made of the area; second, the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as reflected by the survey; third, an advisory committee composed of representatives of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operations; fourth, arrangements have been worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours; and, fifth, such accounting and evaluation procedures as the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will be provided.

A few observations regarding these requirements may be useful. First, requirements of a job survey be made available to the area and that the training program of the school and skill center reflect the job market needs as reflected by the survey. While this may seem so elementary that one would wonder why it is necessary to write such a requirement into the statute, the facts are that, in all too many cases, this fundamental step has not been taken. As a result, we often find the training and skills taught have little if any relation to the local and State job markets. As a result, at the end of their training, graduates frequently find frustration, not jobs. These requirements will help to assure that jobs are available by requiring that the center be geared to the present and projected job opportunities. By further insisting as the third requirement does that "an advisory committee composed of business, labor, education, and community leaders be formed to follow the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations regarding its operation," we will make certain that there will be a continuous following of the center's activities to assure that the centers will respond to changes in the job market and that there will be the needed interaction between the centers and industry, labor, education, and the community.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States in a task force report, entitled "The Disadvantaged Poor: Education and Employment," underscored the need for these requirements by noting:

(One of the reasons) why vocational-technical education suffers is that courses are insufficiently related to actual labor market conditions; courses often prepare people for jobs that either do not exist or are disappearing. As John H. Fischer, President of Teachers College, Columbia University, points out, "schools have adhered too long and too closely to concepts of [vocational] curriculum and organization developed forty years ago." In some places, courses are still centered around woodworking and mechanical drawing at a time when the economy needs—and compensates well—mechanics, computer operators, electrical appliance repairmen, welders, tool and die makers, carpenters, lathe operators and a host of other highly respectable skills.

As Dr. Swanson points out and as the Task Force learned first hand during field trips, schools do not generally know what jobs are available in a community. Schools do not generally know of the changing skills and knowledge requirements of many job opportunities. Less is known about the number and kinds of job opportunities that may be available in the future when today's younger students complete their educations. Without current and projected information about the labor market, schools cannot design and carry out effective vocational-technical education programs. To the extent the schools fail to prepare their graduates for jobs, the image of vocational-technical education deteriorates. A vicious circle effect emerges. As one panelist told the Task Force, the single most effective way to uplift the prestige of vocational-technical education and promote incentives for people to enroll is for vocational education to demonstrate success in leading people to well paid and respectable jobs.

Effective vocational education is pivotal to the alleviation of poverty. Few jobs remain that require no training or skills. For every scientist and engineer half a dozen or more technicians and craftsmen are needed. And the men who build, test, try out, adjust and repair equipment are as vital in an industrial economy as the scientists and engineers who create. Graduates of vocational-technical training are in great demand by industry and business. In a recent survey by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 90 percent of the local chamber of commerce executives reported that their members have been voicing concern about the shortages of skilled manpower.

An advisory committee assigned the responsibility to continually review the center's activities and to make periodic recommendations thereto should prove mutually beneficial to the center and to labor, industry, and the community. The chamber's task force discussed the benefits that may result therefrom in the following manner:

To achieve this, educators should take the initiative, inviting the interest and involvement of business and industry. Businessmen can help design vocational-technical education programs by keeping education officials thoroughly informed about current and anticipated job markets and about changes in the skills and knowledge needed by the economy. Businessmen can help by lending their own experts to help the school system train vocational-technical teachers. Businessmen can help by providing up-to-date equipment to schools or advising school officials about new equipment being introduced in industry. Businessmen can help by taking an active interest in placing graduates of vocational-technical training in jobs immediately upon graduation. Businessmen can help by insisting that vocational-technical schools publish periodic reports on their graduates' success in finding jobs for which they were trained or in entering apprenticeship and advanced training programs for which the schools qualify them. Finally, businessmen can help by promoting more and better vocational-technical training high schools and junior colleges wherever they are needed.

It is in the interest of businessmen to involve themselves actively in public school vocational-technical education. To the extent that public schools can turn out people ready for employment, businessmen are saved training expenses. In many cases businessmen are saved taxes that would be necessary to meet welfare and law enforcement problems often associated with undereducation and unemployment. Remarkable progress has resulted where business has taken an active part in vocational-technical education.

Labor leaders can also make a contribution to improved vocational-technical education. Craft unions can open their apprenticeship

programs to graduates of vocational programs, without regard to race or minority affiliation. Labor leaders can cooperate by making people available to speak to young people and acquaint them with various aspects of different jobs and with expected on-the-job behavior. And labor leaders can consult with businessmen and educators in designing programs that prepare graduates adequately to cope with on-the-job conditions.

The fourth requirement "that arrangements be worked out with schools in the area and the administrator of the skill center for maximum utilization of the center both during and after school hours" is aimed at demonstrating how communities may make maximum utilization of an expensive facility. American citizens across the Nation have a tremendous investment in educational facilities. Yet, anachronisms from our past linger in American education.

Today, as in our past, at the end of our typical schoolday, which generally continues to run from 8:30 to 3:30, and at the close of the school year, which generally runs from September to June, the schools are deserted. I have even read cases where playgrounds have been locked, thus preventing youngsters from using them. There are, of course, places where the schools are used to a greater extent and summer programs are coming into vogue in more and more areas. This, however, is not the general picture nationwide. There customs originated in our agrarian past. It allowed students an opportunity to assist with the chores in the evening and the 3-month interval in the summer enabled the gathering of the harvest.

For today's urban Johnny, the reasons and rationale for the customs no longer hold true. This is particularly the case in some of our schools located in urban areas serving a large number of disadvantaged youngsters. Here the youngsters need extra help, extra time. Particularly, then, for these youngsters carryovers from our past need reexamining. Schools should be the work horse of the community. They should be the hub of community activity. They should be used as nearly as possible around the clock, around the year. Thus, requirement 4 attempts to demonstrate how an expensive facility with expensive equipment may be used to the maximum feasible extent.

The fifth requirement assures that accounting and evaluating procedures will be provided. Educational level of the participants, vocational skills, placement records and the number of dropouts along with other matters are critical if we are to make a judgment as to the success of a program. I have been insisting that the poverty program provide the data necessary for Congress to evaluate its programs. This requirement will see that the information is provided for this pilot program.

Mr. President, 750,000 young Americans drop out of school each year. For these dropouts a difficult road lies ahead. Today's technological society demands educated and skilled workers. Job opportunities for the unskilled and the poorly educated continue to diminish.

In reading the Nation's newspapers, one can see daily the evidence of the mismatch between the job openings and the workers. There are jobs available. Unfortunately, lack of education and training prevent many from filling them. These 750,000 dropouts must be the target. For lack of education and training are the root causes of many of our problems.

The amendment I offered has the potential of reaching these root causes. I am most excited about its potential. I intend to follow the pilot projects most closely.

Unlike the Job Corps, which is a repair job and an expensive one, the purpose of this program is preventive. We have heard testimony before the Subcommittee on Education expressing concern over the imbalance of Federal funding going to treat the problem—Job Corps—and Federal funds going to prevent the problem before it occurs—vocational education. We spend \$295 million for Job Corps to repair and rehabilitate the dropout, but we are investing only \$230 million of Federal funds on vocational education.

Mr. Johnson, president of the American Vocational Association, put it this way:

It seems to me that there is today at the federal level an imbalance of expenditures for various levels and types of educational programs. For higher education, federal expenditures are \$4.5 billion. For elementary and secondary education, \$3.2 billion; for occupational training of various types, including Office of Economic Opportunity programs, MDTA, \$1.8 billion. Of the \$1.8 billion, only \$280 million was authorized for vocational training in high schools, other vocational schools, community and junior colleges, and technical institutions.

Yet, Mr. President, presently there are 7 million youngsters enrolled in vocational educational programs and by 1970, this number is expected to reach 9½ million. Even if the Job Corps were successful with all of the youngsters it has served—and it clearly is not—it would still be a "drop in the bucket." It seems rather clear that vocational education must be our frontline in our battle against the dropouts. It is further clear to me, Mr. President, that preventive programs are less costly and more effective than programs which attempt to rehabilitate and repair a youngster after he has already departed from the public school system. The number-of-dropouts rate makes it imperative that we mount an attack. It is my hope that this pilot program will be a significant step in that direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if I have any to yield back, I yield back the remainder of my time.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it may be that the distinguished acting majority leader can be responsive to the question I have in mind.

I believe on yesterday we determined that after action on this measure had been completed, we would proceed to the

Department of Transportation appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that still the plan?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is still the plan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And following that, we were to take up State, Justice, and Commerce?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I believe that has been changed, and it has been determined that NASA will follow Transportation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And then State, Justice, and Commerce?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the Senator's judgment, are we likely to get beyond NASA today?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So State, Justice, and Commerce would go over, probably, until tomorrow?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Or Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the plan about coming in tomorrow?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have not discussed that with the majority leader. I see he has returned to the Chamber. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had intended to ask the distinguished majority leader about that schedule, but I believe the changes have been noted: that NASA will follow Transportation, and State, Justice, Commerce probably thereafter, and then finally public works?

Mr. MANSFIELD. With one minor correction. Transportation appropriations will be laid before the Senate following the pending business. It will be followed by NASA, which, in turn will be followed by public works so that, if possible, we will get to that Monday, and give those who are interested a chance to proceed on that bill, to be followed by State, Commerce, and Justice. The last two items are subject to change, if extraordinary circumstances develop.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from this colloquy, I think every Senator can satisfy himself as to what lies ahead for the remainder of the week and Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The leadership should point out that there may be arguments relative to the SST on the Transportation appropriation bill, and there may be some questions raised during the discussion of NASA. There will be considerable debate on the public works appropriation bill, and there will be discussion and debate on the State, Justice, and Commerce bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wanted to give the leadership this information on the appropriation bills: There will be at least one vote on the Transportation appropriation. On NASA, we have four items different than in the House bill, so there could possibly be three or four votes on those items, but that is about all. I do not think there will be many more amendments on NASA, because the disagreement involved only four items.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At least that is enough to give the Senate notice that there may be votes tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we do not finish NASA tonight, there will undoubtedly be a vote on NASA tomorrow, and a vote on final passage, naturally.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, adding to what the distinguished majority leader has said, there probably will be some controversy about the item of the appropriation for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I shall resist, as best I can, every effort to diminish, to reduce, or to cut out that appropriation; and, along with it, I propose to follow up and enlist the aid of every one of the veterans' organizations in this country, which are firmly behind the bill that is now on the calendar; and accordingly, since there has been indication of a possible little filibuster to prevent action, I have filed a motion to suspend the rules, and if we preserve the appropriation, I shall ask to have that bill considered.

It will have to be done under a suspension of the rules, because it is legislative in character, and I am not unmindful of the fact that it requires a two-thirds vote. But every endeavor will be made, under that motion to suspend, to have that added and to complete this action once and for all.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from

Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Were he present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were privileged to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SPONG (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. Were he here and voting he would vote "nay." Were I to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senators from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has been previously amended.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. If pres-

ent and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay" and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 21, as follows:

[No. 282 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Aiken	Griffin	Mondale
Allott	Gruening	Mohroney
Anderson	Harris	Montoya
Baker	Hart	Morse
Bartlett	Hatfield	Mundt
Bayh	Inouye	Muskie
Bible	Jackson	Nelson
Boggs	Javits	Pearson
Brewster	Kennedy, Mass.	Pell
Burdick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Percy
Cannon	Kuchel	Prouty
Case	Lausche	Proxmire
Church	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Clark	Long, La.	Scott
Cooper	Magnuson	Smathers
Cotton	McCarthy	Smith
Dirksen	McGee	Symington
Fong	McGovern	Tydings
Fulbright	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Metcalf	Yarborough

NAYS—21

Curtis	Hartke	Miller
Dominick	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Eastland	Holland	Stennis
Ellender	Hollings	Thurmond
Ervin	Jordan, N.C.	Tower
Fannin	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Hansen	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett	Hill	Russell
Brooke	Hruska	Sparkman
Byrd, Va.	Mansfield	Spong
Byrd, W. Va.	Morton	Talmadge
Carlson	Moss	Young, Ohio
Dodd	Pastore	
Hayden	Randolph	

So the bill (S. 2388) was passed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make technical and clerical corrections in the engrossment of S. 2388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has witnessed the outstanding skill and ability of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. He directed this authorization for the war against poverty with the same articulate advocacy that has characterized his many notable achievements in this body. The Senate deeply appreciates his efforts on this measure; those who shall continue to benefit from the poverty program are forever in his debt.

Joining Senator CLARK to assure this overwhelming success were the two senior committee members from the other side of the aisle, whose diligence and strong efforts in behalf of the poverty stricken have long been well known. I refer of course to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. Both exhibited their abiding devotion to the welfare and interest of the poor; their strong efforts are immensely appreciated.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] similarly are to be commended for helping to ob-

tain the decisive approval of the Senate on this measure. Cooperating to make certain that the proposal would receive efficient disposition were the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. They demonstrated a broad and knowledgeable understanding of the poverty program, as did the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA].

While the Senate spent nearly 2 weeks discussing this authorization, I do feel that its thorough consideration was of great value, insofar as it highlighted much of the constructive work being accomplished by the poverty program, noting also some of the mistakes that have occurred. In any event, the authorization adopted will permit the war on poverty to continue as a viable and effective program.

The Senate may be proud of another great achievement.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 557, H.R. 11456. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An act (H.R. 11456) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. HOLLINGS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] has finished with his remarks, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of the committee handling the bill, be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUR NATIONAL INTEREST IN VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to address myself to one specific portion of a much larger question—the question of Vietnam. It is not my purpose to debate the origin of our involvement there nor do I intend to comment on the conduct of the war. I support our involvement there. I disagree in part with the way the war is being conducted.

But my purpose today is to answer what I believe is the question uppermost in the minds of the citizens of this country: What is our national interest in Vietnam? Recently, this question has been asked on the floor of the Senate. Twice I have heard it said that our national security is not dependent on our stand in Vietnam. This assertion came from two of

the most distinguished Members of this body—the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. President, I do not pretend to have the experience of either of these gentlemen in foreign affairs, nor do I presume to place my judgment over theirs. But I do not agree. I believe our national security is at stake, and I believe that we do, indeed, have a great national interest in Vietnam.

I do not mean to imply that if we do not prevail in Vietnam, the battleground tomorrow will be Los Angeles County, because that is not so. However, in my opinion, our national interests in Vietnam are just as great as if this were the case. I believe our interest there is twofold.

First, we are fighting in Southeast Asia for the credibility of this Nation and her commitments. The belief that the United States means what she says in her international commitments is the keystone to freedom and is by necessity, the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

By continuing to honor our commitment in Vietnam, we are proving this credibility in three ways:

First. We are telling the Communist nations that aggression and the use of force against free nations shall be met with force by this country.

Second. We are telling our allies that we keep our word, that they can believe what we say, that this country fully intends to stand behind NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS, or any other common defense pact to which we are party.

Third. We are telling the uncommitted nations of the world that our commitment to freedom and self-determination is much more than a policy line—we are saying that it is a living, breathing, viable doctrine—and the very essence of the democratic system.

The second part of our twofold purpose for fighting in Vietnam is the autonomy of Southeast Asia. And guaranteeing this autonomy is inextricably bound to our national interest.

The aggression of the Communists in South Vietnam is not the only example of aggression in Southeast Asia.

Today we have Communist cadres in Laos, in Thailand, and more recently in Cambodia.

These countries are already earmarked for Communist takeover if we do not prevail in Vietnam. There is no question about this in my mind. There is no doubt about it in the minds of the leaders of Southeast Asia.

Recently, Lee Kuang Yew, of Singapore, said:

If we can prevail, all of eastern Asia will be closer to stability than at any time in this century. If you do not hold out, we are finished.

Similar sentiments have been voiced by President Marcos, of the Philippines, and Thanat Khoman, Foreign Minister of Thailand.

Charles de Gaulle may sulk over his lost colonialism. After defeat in Vietnam, he may find the stand of other nations for peace in the Far East a threat to peace.

But the nations immediately involved know who is who and what is what.

They know it is aggression in Vietnam—not civil war.

They know the ultimate goal of the Communists.

They know, as I know, that South Vietnam is merely the opening play of an attempt to subjugate all of Southeast Asia through "national liberation."

Other than a continuing desire for world conquest, the motivation behind the Communist aggression in this part of the globe is not difficult to fathom. Southeast Asia is one of the richly endowed areas in the world.

This is why the French fought so hard to maintain their hegemony there.

The area known as the "rice bowl of the world" has the potential to feed the hungry of India and Red China combined.

It contains over 250 million people, or some 10 percent of the world's population.

It produces 80 percent of the world's natural rubber and 60 percent of the world's supply of tin.

Additionally, large amounts of oil, copra, bauxite, and sugar are produced in this region.

Is there any wonder that the Communists deem Southeast Asia such a prize—a prize to be taken by sheer force if this country does not stand as we are standing in Vietnam and providing the shield against aggression?

This brings me to the final point of my remarks, and my answer to another question which I believe the American people deserve to have answered:

And what will be the result of this Nation's stand in Vietnam?

What do we hope to achieve?

The first and most obvious desired result would be the end of aggression against South Vietnam. I would hope that with the end of this aggression, the United States could bring its troops home and proceed with the business of assisting Vietnam in building a strong and stable economy and the type of representative democratic government that I am convinced they want. If we are successful in this effort, then I believe we would realize an additional and even greater benefit in that we would acquire as allies many of the now uncommitted Southeast Asian countries.

On Tuesday, the Senator from Arkansas pressed the Senator from Illinois, questioning:

What does the Senator say is the objective of our war in Vietnam? What is it that we wish to achieve that is worthy of what we are doing? Does he want a colony?

Would the Senator from Arkansas have argued in World War II that our goal was to make a colony of Germany or of Italy? When we prevailed over Japan, did we make that a colony? When we assisted the Nationalist Chinese, did we make colonies of Quemoy and Matsu? When we defended South Korea, did we give her colonial government or free government? When we intervened at the Dominican, did we acquire a colony or did we give her people freedom? When we flew the blockade and President Kennedy proclaimed "Ich bin ein Berliner," did he mean that the people of Berlin were American subjects—or symbols of

a free people for the world to behold? Who gave Cuba her first and only freedom? Who gave autonomy to the Philippines? Who took possessions and gave them statehood and citizenship? No, my colleagues, to suggest that our stand in Vietnam is tinged by any other than a hope for world peace and freedom belies the history of this Republic and her people.

It has been said that in political discussion, heat is in inverse proportion to knowledge, and the debate on Vietnam proves the point. The torrent of argument has completely obscured the greatness of the battle. This greatness lies not in destroying the enemy but in building a nation. General Westmoreland calls it "the work of a generation." This is the first time in history that men engaged in war are at the same time building a free society. The eyes of over 1 billion people in the Far East watch with interest. Since the emergence of Red China, Peking has told these people that the white man was not interested in the yellow man; that rich America had no concern for the poor lands of the Pacific; and that communism was the wave of the future. Now 38 nations are actively engaged in the support of South Vietnam. And the greatest Asian effort to preserve its own freedom is underway. The real issue is not between those who want to escalate and those who want to come to terms. The fundamental issue is whether America, the world's richest and most powerful nation, possesses the greatness of heart, the tenacity of spirit, and the moral strength to give what communism has failed to give the nations—a great and satisfying purpose for living as well as the means for livelihood. In other words, the issue is not the escalation of the military, but the escalation of the spirit of man. We have already taken significant steps down that road. A new constitution has been promulgated and a representative government chosen in free elections. American aid has brought to the people of South Vietnam health care, and agricultural technology. But far more important than money, machines, and materialism—we have brought them hope. Hope that a war of 20 years duration might finally come to an end—hope that they might be permitted to live in peace and prosperity.

If we can do this for Vietnam, we can do it for the millions of Asia. And, unwittingly, for the first time, we would have a Far East policy—a policy with which we can all agree. And even more significant, we will have come one step closer to the end of Communist aggression and one step closer to world freedom and world peace. If we can make that step, then we will have indeed served our national interest well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Mississippi was to have been recognized. Since he is not in the Chamber, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

VIETNAM—A RESOLUTION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators BENNETT, BOGGS, BYRD of Vir-

ginia, CARLSON, CLARK, COTTON, CURTIS, HANSEN, HATFIELD, HRUSKA, JAVITS, JORDAN of Idaho, MORTON, PEARSON, PROUDY, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SCOTT, TALMADGE, THURMOND, and YOUNG of North Dakota, I am submitting the following resolution:

S. RES. 173

Whereas a solution of the Vietnam war can best be found through regional cooperation in military, diplomatic, economic and psychological efforts; and

Whereas pending negotiations for a just settlement of the war, the non-Communist nations of Asia must work together; and

Whereas the leaders of these nations insist that prosecution of the war is of vital concern to their peoples; and

Whereas the leaders of South Vietnam insist that prosecution of the war is essential to the security of their country,

Resolved, in the hope that it will promote more Allied cooperation in bringing an end to the war, it is the sense of the Senate that—

(a) The Armed Forces of the United States should not continue to bear an ever-increasing proportion of the fighting in Vietnam; and

(b) The non-Communist nations of Asia, including South Vietnam, should contribute substantially more manpower and resources to share the military, diplomatic, economic and psychological tasks in Vietnam; and

(c) The President of the United States should move with greater determination to obtain commitments of such manpower and resources in support of the effort in Vietnam.

Mr. President, less than 3 months before his death, President Kennedy said of the Vietnam war and of our South Vietnamese allies:

In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam . . .

At that time Asian troops still carried the burden of the war. There were only 15,000 American forces in South Vietnam.

Today the United States carries the burden of the war. More than half a million American men are involved there now. Asian troops, other than the South Vietnamese themselves, number fewer than 50,000. In some periods, American casualties have surpassed South Vietnamese casualties.

Despite President Johnson's 1964 warning that "We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys," we are tied down in a land war in Asia and we have taken over the major burden of combat from the South Vietnamese. In other words, it has become our war.

I think this is as much a mistake today as it would have been in 1963, when President Kennedy spoke, or in 1964, when President Johnson spoke. U.S. domination of the war is a mistake because American men and money are being sucked into the quicksand of Vietnam in extravagant numbers, and the end is nowhere in sight. It is a mistake because it is the Asians' freedom and right to self-determination that presumably will be endangered if South Vietnam falls. The war is already costing the United States almost \$30 billion a year, yet failure threatens Asian security far more than our own.

It is long since time that Asian nations

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2388

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 9, 1967

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

AN ACT

To provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity
4 Amendments of 1967".

5 AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

6 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out programs under
7 the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (other than part C
8 of title I of such Act), there is hereby authorized to be ap-

1 appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the
2 sum of \$2,258,000,000, of which, subject to the provisions
3 of section 616 of such Act, the amounts appropriated or
4 made available by appropriation Act shall not exceed \$295,-
5 000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
6 part A of title I of such Act, \$567,000,000 for the purpose
7 of carrying out part B of title I, \$105,000,000 for the pur-
8 pose of carrying out part D of title I, \$1,062,000,000 for the
9 purpose of carrying out title II, \$20,000,000 for the pur-
10 pose of carrying out part A of title III, \$30,000,000 for the
11 purpose of carrying out part B of title III, \$25,000,000 for
12 the purpose of carrying out section 406 of title IV, \$70,000,-
13 000 for the purpose of carrying out part A of title V, \$35,-
14 000,000 for the purpose of carrying out part B of title V,
15 \$16,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VI, and
16 \$33,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out title VIII, and
17 there is authorized to be appropriated \$2,400,000,000 for
18 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

19 **TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC**
20 **OPPORTUNITY ACT**

21 **JOB CORPS AMENDMENTS**

22 **SEC. 101.** Part A of title I of the Economic Oppor-
23 tunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

1 "PART A—JOB CORPS

2 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

3 "SEC. 101. This part establishes a Job Corps for low-
4 income, disadvantaged young men and women, sets forth
5 standards and procedures for selecting individuals as en-
6 rollees in the Job Corps, authorizes the establishment of
7 residential centers in which enrollees will participate in
8 intensive programs of education, vocational training, work
9 experience, counseling, and other activities, and prescribes
10 various other powers, duties, and responsibilities incident to
11 the operation and continuing development of the Job Corps.
12 Its purpose is to assist young persons who need and can
13 benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in
14 a group setting, to become more responsible, employable,
15 and productive citizens; and to do so in a way that con-
16 tributes, where feasible, to the development of National,
17 State, and community resources, and to the development
18 and dissemination of techniques for working with the dis-
19 advantaged that can be widely utilized by public and
20 private institutions and agencies.

21 "ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOB CORPS

22 "SEC. 102. There is hereby established within the Office
23 of Economic Opportunity a 'Job Corps'.

1 “INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE FOR THE JOB CORPS

2 “SEC. 103. To become an enrollee in the Job Corps, a
3 young man or woman must be a person who—

4 “(1) is a permanent resident of the United States
5 who has attained age sixteen but not attained age twenty-
6 two at the time of enrollment;

7 “(2) is a low-income individual or member of a
8 low-income family who requires additional education,
9 training, or intensive counseling and related assistance
10 in order to secure or hold meaningful employment,
11 participate successfully in regular schoolwork, qualify
12 for other training programs suitable to his needs or satisfy
13 Armed Forces requirements;

14 “(3) is currently living in an environment so char-
15 acterized by cultural deprivation, a disruptive homelife
16 or other disorienting conditions as to substantially impair
17 his prospects for successful participation in any other
18 program providing needed training, education, or assist-
19 ance;

20 “(4) is determined, after careful screening as pro-
21 vided for in sections 104 and 105, to have the present
22 capabilities and aspirations needed to complete and secure
23 the full benefit of the program authorized in this part,
24 and to be free of medical and behaviorial problems so
25 serious that he could not or would not be able to adjust

1 to the standards of conduct and discipline or pattern
2 of work and training which that program involves; and
3 “(5) meets such other standards for enrollment as
4 the Director may prescribe and agrees to comply with
5 all applicable Job Corps rules and regulations.

6 “SCREENING AND SELECTION OF APPLICANTS—GENERAL
7 PROVISIONS

8 “SEC. 104. (a) The Director shall prescribe necessary
9 rules for the screening and selection of applicants for enroll-
10 ment in the Job Corps. To the extent practicable, these
11 rules shall be implemented through arrangements which
12 make use of appropriate agencies and organizations such as
13 community action agencies, public employment offices, pro-
14 fessional groups, and labor organizations. The rules shall
15 establish specific standards and procedures for conducting
16 screening and selection activities; shall encourage recruit-
17 ment through agencies and individuals having contact with
18 youths over substantial periods of time and able, accord-
19 ingly, to offer reliable information as to their needs and
20 problems; and shall provide for necessary consultation with
21 other individuals and organizations, including courts, proba-
22 tion and parole offices, law enforcement authorities, schools,
23 welfare agencies, and medical agencies, and advisers. They
24 shall also provide for—

1 “(1) the interviewing of each applicant for the pur-
2 pose of—

3 “(A) determining whether his educational and
4 vocational needs can best be met through the Job
5 Corps or any alternative program in his home
6 community;

7 “(B) obtaining from the applicant pertinent
8 data relating to his background, needs, and interests
9 for evaluation in determining his eligibility and po-
10 tential assignment; and

11 “(C) giving the applicant a full understand-
12 ing of the Job Corps program and making clear
13 what will be expected of him as an enrollee in the
14 event of his acceptance.

15 “(2) the conduct of a careful and systematic in-
16 quiry concerning the applicant's background for the
17 effective development and, as appropriate, clarification
18 of information concerning his age, citizenship, school
19 and draft status, health, employability, past behavior,
20 family income, environment, and other matters related
21 to a determination of his eligibility.

22 “(b) The Director shall make no payments to any in-
23 dividual or organization solely as compensation for the serv-
24 ice of referring the names of candidates for enrollment in the
25 Job Corps.

1 “(c) The Director shall take all necessary steps to as-
2 sure that the enrollment of the Job Corps includes an ap-
3 propriate number of candidates selected from rural areas,
4 taking into account the proportion of eligible youth who
5 reside in rural areas and the need to provide residential fa-
6 cilities for such youth in order to meet problems of wide
7 geographic dispersion.

8 “SCREENING AND SELECTION—SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

9 “SEC. 105. (a) No individual shall be selected as an
10 enrollee unless it is determined that there is reasonable
11 expectation that he can participate successfully in group
12 situations and activities with other enrollees, that he is not
13 likely to engage in actions or behavior that would prevent
14 other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program
15 or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline
16 and satisfactory relationships between any center to which
17 he might be assigned and surrounding communities, and that
18 he manifests a basic understanding of both the rules to which
19 he will be subject and of the consequences of failure to
20 observe those rules. In the case of an individual with a
21 history of serious and violent behavior, or a history of repeti-
22 tive or serious law violation or delinquent acts, such deter-
23 mination must be supported by a signed statement from an
24 official of the individual's community, such as the appropriate

1 prosecuting attorney or his deputy, sheriff or his deputy,
2 chief of police or his deputy, parole or probation officer, or
3 chief executive officer, certifying that the individual, if
4 selected, is likely to participate successfully in the program
5 and is unlikely to engage in activities or behavior that would
6 impede other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the pro-
7 gram or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound
8 discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center
9 to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities.

10 “(b) An individual who otherwise qualifies for enroll-
11 ment may be selected even though he is on probation or
12 parole, but only if his release from the immediate supervision
13 of the cognizant probation or parole officials is mutually
14 satisfactory to those officials and the Director and does not
15 violate applicable laws or regulations, and if the Director
16 has arranged to provide all supervision of the individual and
17 all reports to State or other authorities that may be neces-
18 sary to comply with applicable probation or parole require-
19 ments.

20 “ENROLLMENT AND ASSIGNMENT

21 “SEC. 106. (a) No individual may be enrolled in the
22 Job Corps for more than two years, except as the Director
23 may authorize in special cases.

24 “(b) Enrollment in the Job Corps shall not relieve

1 any individual of obligations under the Universal Military
2 Training and Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.).

3 “(c) Each enrollee (other than a native and citizen of
4 Cuba described in section 609 (3) of this Act) must take
5 and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form:
6 ‘I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and
7 allegiance to the United States of America and will support
8 and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States
9 against all its enemies foreign and domestic.’ The provi-
10 sions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall
11 be applicable to this oath or affirmation.

12 “(d) Each enrollee shall be assigned to a center appro-
13 priate to his needs, as determined by the Director, which
14 (taking into account current vacancies and requirements for
15 the efficient program operation) is closest to the residence of
16 such enrollee.

17 “(e) Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so
18 that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those en-
19 rollees are assigned to conservation centers, as described in
20 section 107, or to other centers or projects where their
21 work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, de-
22 velopment, or management of public natural resources or
23 recreational areas and is performed under the direction of

1 personnel of agencies regularly responsible for those
2 functions.

3 "JOB CORPS CENTERS

4 "SEC. 107. (a) The Director may make agreements with
5 Federal, State, or local agencies, or private organizations for
6 the establishment and operation of Job Corps centers. These
7 centers shall be primarily residential in character and shall
8 be designated and operated so as to provide enrollees, in a
9 well-supervised setting, with education, vocational training,
10 work experience (either in direct program activities or
11 through arrangements with employers), counseling and other
12 services appropriate to their needs. The centers shall in-
13 clude conservation centers to be located primarily in rural
14 areas and to provide, in addition to other training and as-
15 sistance, programs of work experience focused upon activities
16 to conserve, develop, or manage public natural resources or
17 public recreational areas or to assist in developing community
18 projects in the public interest. They shall also include men's
19 training centers to be located in either urban or rural areas
20 and to provide activities which shall include training and
21 other services appropriate for enrollees who can be expected
22 to participate successfully in training for specific types of
23 skilled or semiskilled employment; and women's training cen-
24 ters, to be located in either urban or rural areas, and which

1 shall provide education, training, and other activities appro-
2 priate to the special needs and potentialities of young women.

3 “(b) To the extent feasible, men’s and women’s train-
4 ing centers shall offer education and vocational training op-
5 portunities, together with supportive services, on a nonresi-
6 dential basis to enrollees in programs described in part B of
7 this title. Such opportunities may be offered on a reimburs-
8 able basis or through such other arrangements as the Direc-
9 tor may specify.

10 “PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

11 “SEC. 108. (a) Each Job Corps center shall be oper-
12 ated so as to provide enrollees with an intensive, well-orga-
13 nized and fully supervised program of education, vocational
14 training, work experience, planned avocational and recrea-
15 tional activities, physical rehabilitation and development, and
16 counseling. To the fullest extent feasible, the required pro-
17 gram for each enrollee shall include activities designed to
18 assist him in choosing realistic career goals, coping with
19 problems he may encounter in his home community or in
20 adjusting to a new community, and planning and managing
21 his daily affairs in a manner that will best contribute to long-
22 term upward mobility. Center programs shall include re-
23 quired participation in center maintenance support and
24 related work activity as appropriate to assist enrollees in

1 increasing their sense of contribution, responsibility, and
2 discipline.

3 “(b) To the extent practicable, the Director may ar-
4 range for enrollee education and vocational training through
5 local public or private educational agencies, vocational educa-
6 tional institutions, or technical institutes where these institu-
7 tions or institutes can provide training comparable in cost and
8 substantially equivalent in quality to that which he could
9 provide through other means.

10 “(c) Arrangements for education shall, to the extent
11 feasible, provide opportunities for qualified enrollees to obtain
12 the equivalent of a certificate of graduation from high school;
13 and the Director, with the concurrence of the Secretary of
14 Health, Education, and Welfare, shall develop certificates to
15 be issued to enrollees who have satisfactorily completed their
16 services in the Job Corps and which will reflect the enrollee’s
17 level of educational attainment.

18 “(d) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure
19 that Job Corps work-experience programs or activities do
20 not displace presently employed workers or impair existing
21 contracts for service and will be coordinated with other
22 work-experience programs in the community.

23 “ALLOWANCE AND SUPPORT

24 “SEC. 109. (a) The Director may provide enrollees
25 with such personal travel and leave allowances, and such

1 quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing,
2 recreational services, and other expenses as he may deem
3 necessary or appropriate to their needs. Personal allowances
4 shall be established at a rate not to exceed \$35 per month
5 during the first six months of an enrollee's participation in the
6 program and in not to exceed \$65 per month thereafter, ex-
7 cept that allowances in excess of \$35 per month, but not
8 exceeding \$65 per month, may be provided from the be-
9 ginning of an enrollee's participation if it is expected to be
10 of less than six months' duration, and the Director is author-
11 ized to pay personal allowances in excess of the rates speci-
12 fied herein in unusual circumstances as determined by him.
13 Such allowances shall be graduated up to the maximum so as
14 to encourage continued participation in the program, achieve-
15 ment and the best use by the enrollee of the funds so provided
16 and shall be subject to reduction in appropriate cases as a
17 disciplinary measure. To the degree reasonable, enrollees
18 shall be required to meet or contribute to costs associated
19 with their individual comfort and enjoyment from their per-
20 sonal allowances.

21 “(b) The Director shall prescribe specific rules govern-
22 ing the accrual of leave by enrollees. Except in the case of
23 emergency, he shall in no event assume transportation costs
24 connected with leave of any enrollee who has not completed
25 at least six months service in the Job Corps.

1 “(c) The Director shall provide each former enrollee,
2 upon termination, a readjustment allowance at a rate not to
3 exceed \$50 for each month of satisfactory participation in the
4 Job Corps: *Provided, however,* That no enrollee shall be en-
5 titled to that portion of a readjustment allowance which is not
6 paid pursuant to subsection (d) of this section unless he has
7 remained in the program at least one hundred and eighty
8 days, except that such portion shall be paid to an enrollee
9 who has remained in the program at least ninety days and
10 whose participation in the program is expected to be of less
11 than six months’ duration, and except in unusual circum-
12 stances as determined by the Director. The Director may,
13 from time to time, advance to or on behalf of an enrollee
14 such portions of his readjustment allowance as the Director
15 deems necessary to meet extraordinary financial obligations
16 incurred by that enrollee. In the event of an enrollee’s death
17 during his period of service, the amount of any unpaid read-
18 justment allowance shall be paid in accordance with the pro-
19 visions of section 5582 of title 5, United States Code.

20 “(d) Under such circumstances as the Director may
21 determine, a portion of the readjustment allowance of an
22 enrollee not exceeding \$25 for each month of satisfactory
23 service may be paid during the period of service of the en-
24 rollee directly to a spouse or child of an enrollee or to any
25 other relative who draws substantial support from the en-

1 rollee, and any sum so paid shall be supplemented by the
2 payment of an equal amount by the Director.

3 "STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

4 "SEC. 110. (a) Within Job Corps centers, standards of
5 conduct and deportment shall be provided and stringently
6 enforced. In the case of violations committed by enrollees,
7 dismissals from the Corps or transfers to other locations
8 shall be made in every instance where it is determined that
9 retention in the Corps, or in the particular Job Corps center,
10 will jeopardize the enforcement of such standards of conduct
11 and deportment or diminish the opportunity of other
12 enrollees.

13 "(b) In order to promote the proper moral and dis-
14 ciplinary conditions in the Job Corps, the individual directors
15 of Job Corps centers shall be given full authority to take
16 appropriate disciplinary measures against enrollees including,
17 but not limited to, dismissal from the Job Corps, subject to
18 expeditious appeal procedures to higher authority, as pro-
19 vided under regulation set by the Director.

20 "COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

21 "SEC. 111. The Director shall encourage and shall
22 cooperate in activities designed to establish mutually bene-
23 ficial relationships between Job Corps centers and sur-
24 rounding or nearby communities.

1 "COUNSELING AND JOB PLACEMENT

2 "SEC. 112. (a) The Director shall provide for the
3 counseling and testing of each enrollee at regular intervals to
4 follow his progress in educational and vocational programs.

5 "(b) The Director shall counsel and test each enrollee
6 prior to his scheduled termination to determine his capabil-
7 ities and shall seek to place him in a job in the vocation for
8 which he is trained and in which he is likely to succeed, or
9 shall assist him in attaining further training or education. In
10 placing enrollees in jobs, the Director shall utilize the United
11 States Employment Service to the fullest extent possible.

12 "(c) The Secretary of Labor shall make arrangements
13 to determine the status and progress of terminees and to
14 assure that their needs for further education, training, and
15 counseling may be met.

16 "(d) Upon termination of an enrollee's training, a copy
17 of his pertinent records, including data derived from his
18 counseling and testing, other than confidential information,
19 shall be made available immediately to the Department of
20 Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

21 "(e) The Director shall, to the extent feasible in ac-
22 cordance with section 637 (b) of this Act, arrange for the
23 readjustment allowance provided for in section 109 (c) of
24 such Act, less any sums already paid pursuant to subsection
25 (d) of that section, to be paid to former enrollees (who have

1 not already found employment) at the public employment
2 service office nearest the home of any such former enrollee,
3 if he is returning to his home, or at the nearest such office
4 to the community in which the former enrollee has indicated
5 an intent to reside. The Secretary of Labor shall make ar-
6 rangements by which public employment service officers will
7 maintain records regarding former enrollees who are thus
8 paid at such offices including information as to—

9 “(1) the number of former enrollees who have de-
10 clined the offices’ help in finding a job;

11 “(2) the number who were successfully placed in
12 jobs without further education or training;

13 “(3) the number who were found to require further
14 training before being placed in jobs and the types of
15 training programs in which they participated; and

16 “(4) the number who were found to require fur-
17 ther remedial or basic education in order to qualify for
18 training programs, together with information as to the
19 types of programs for which such former enrollees were
20 found unqualified for enrollment.

21 If the Director deems it advisable to utilize the services of
22 any other public or private organization or agency in lieu
23 of the public employment office, he shall arrange for that
24 organization or agency to make the payment of the readjust-

1 ment allowance and maintain the same types of records re-
2 garding former enrollees as are herein specified for mainte-
3 nance by public employment service offices, and shall furnish
4 copies of such records to the Secretary of Labor. In the case
5 of enrollees who are placed in jobs by the Director prior to
6 the termination of their participation in the Job Corps, the
7 Director shall maintain records providing pertinent place-
8 ment and follow-up information.

9 "EVALUATION; EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL
10 PROJECTS

11 "SEC. 113. (a) The Director shall provide for the care-
12 ful and systematic evaluation of the Job Corps program,
13 directly or by contracting for independent evaluations,
14 with a view to measuring specific benefits, so far as prac-
15 ticable, and providing information needed to assess the
16 effectiveness of program procedures, policies, and methods
17 of operation. In particular, this evaluation shall seek to de-
18 termine the costs and benefits resulting from the use of res-
19 idential as opposed to nonresidential facilities, from the use
20 of facilities combining residential and nonresidential com-
21 ponents, from the use of centers with large as opposed to
22 small enrollments, and from the use of different types of
23 program sponsors, including public agencies, universities,
24 and private corporations. The evaluation shall also include
25 comparisons with proper control groups composed of per-

sons who have not participated in the program. In carrying out such evaluations, the Director shall arrange for obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths and weaknesses of the program and shall consult with other agencies and officials in order to compare the relative effectiveness of Job Corps techniques with those used in other programs, and shall endeavor to secure, through employers, schools, or other Government and private agencies specific information concerning the residence of former enrollees, their employment status, compensation, and success in adjusting to community life. He shall also secure, to the extent feasible, similar information directly from enrollees at appropriate intervals following their completion of the Job Corps program. The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall be summarized in the report required by section 608.

“(b) The Director may undertake or make grants or contracts for experimental, research, or demonstration projects directed to developing or testing ways of securing the better use of facilities, of encouraging a more rapid adjustment of enrollees to community life that will permit a reduction in the period of their enrollment, of reducing transportation and support costs, or of otherwise promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the program authorized under

1 this part. These projects shall include one or more projects
2 providing youths with education, training, and other sup-
3 portive services on a combined residential and nonresidential
4 basis. The Director may, if he deems it advisable, undertake
5 one or more pilot projects designed to involve youth who
6 have a history of serious and violent behavior against persons
7 or property, repetitive delinquent acts, narcotics addiction, or
8 other behavioral aberrations. Projects under this subsection
9 shall be developed after appropriate consultation with other
10 Federal or State agencies conducting similar or related pro-
11 grams or projects and with the prime work and training spon-
12 sors, as described in part B of this title in the communities
13 where the projects will be carried out. They may be under-
14 taken jointly with other Federal or federally assisted pro-
15 grams, including programs under part B of this title, and funds
16 otherwise available for activities under those programs shall,
17 with the consent of the head of any agency concerned, be
18 available to projects under this section to the extent they
19 include the same or substantially similar activities. The
20 Director may waive any provision of this title which he finds
21 would prevent the carrying out of elements of projects under
22 this subsection essential to a determination of their feasibility
23 and usefulness. He shall, either in the report required by
24 section 608 or a separate annual document, report to the
25 Congress concerning the actions taken under this section,

1 including a full description of progress made in connection
2 with combined residential and nonresidential projects.

3 “(c) In order to determine whether upgraded voca-
4 tional education schools could eliminate or substantially re-
5 duce the school dropout problem, and to demonstrate how
6 communities could make maximum utilization of expensive
7 educational and training facilities, the Director, in coopera-
8 tion with the Commissioner of Education, shall enter into
9 one or more agreements with State educational agencies to
10 pay the cost of establishing and operating model community
11 vocational education schools and skill centers. Such facilities
12 shall be centrally located in an urban area having a high
13 dropout rate, a large number of unemployed youths, and a
14 need in the area for a combination vocational school and skill
15 center. No such agreement shall be entered into unless it
16 contains provisions designed to assure that—

17 “(1) a job survey be made of the area;

18 “(2) the training program of the school and skill
19 center reflect the job market needs as projected by the
20 survey;

21 “(3) an advisory committee composed of repre-
22 sentatives of business, labor, education, and community
23 leaders be formed to follow the center’s activities and to
24 make periodic recommendations regarding its operation;

25 “(4) arrangements have been worked out with

1 schools in the area and the administrator of the skill
2 center for maximum utilization of the center both during
3 and after school hours; and

4 “(5) such accounting and evaluation procedures as
5 the Director and the Commissioner of Education deem
6 necessary to carry out the purpose of this project will
7 be provided.

8 “PARTICIPATION OF THE STATES

9 “SEC. 114. (a) The Director shall take necessary action
10 to facilitate the effective participation of States in the Job
11 Corps program, including, but not limited to, consultation
12 with appropriate State agencies on matters pertaining to
13 the enforcement of applicable State laws, standards of en-
14 rollee conduct and discipline, the development of meaning-
15 ful work experience and other activities for enrollees, and
16 coordination with State-operated programs.

17 “(b) The Director may enter into agreements with
18 States to assist in the operation or administration of State-
19 operated programs which carry out the purpose of this part.
20 The Director may, pursuant to regulations, pay part or all of
21 the operative or administrative costs of such programs.

22 “(c) No Job Corps center or other similar facility
23 designed to carry out the purpose of this Act shall be estab-
24 lished within a State unless a plan setting forth such pro-
25 posed establishment has been submitted to the Governor, and

1 such plan has not been disapproved by him within 30 days
2 of such submission.

3 "APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL LAW

4 "SEC. 115. (a) Except as otherwise specifically pro-
5 vided in the following paragraphs of this subsection, enrollees
6 in the Job Corps shall not be considered Federal employees
7 and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to
8 Federal employment, including those regarding hours of
9 work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compen-
10 sation, and Federal employee benefits:

11 "(1) For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of
12 1954 (26 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) and title II of the Social Security
13 Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), enrollees shall be deemed em-
14 ployees of the United States and any service performed by an
15 individual as an enrollee shall be deemed to be performed in
16 the employ of the United States.

17 "(2) For purposes of subchapter I of chapter 81 of
18 title 5 of the United States Code (relating to compensation
19 to Federal employees for work injuries), enrollees shall be
20 deemed civil employees of the United States within the
21 meaning of the term 'employee' as defined in section 8101 of
22 title 5, United States Code, and the provisions of that sub-
23 chapter shall apply except as follows:

24 "(A) The term 'performance of duty' shall not in-
25 clude any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her

1 assigned post of duty, except while participating in an
2 activity (including an activity while on pass or during
3 travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or
4 under the direction and supervision of the Job Corps;

5 “(B) In computing compensation benefits for dis-
6 ability or death, the monthly pay of an enrollee shall be
7 deemed that received under the entrance salary for a
8 grade GS-2 employee, and sections 8113 (a) and (b) of
9 title 5, United States Code, shall apply to enrollees; and

10 “(C) Compensation for disability shall not begin to
11 accrue until the day following the date on which the
12 injured enrollee is terminated.

13 “(3) For purposes of the Federal tort claims provisions
14 in title 28, United States Code, enrollees shall be considered
15 employees of the Government.

16 “(b) When the Director finds a claim for damage to
17 persons or property resulting from the operation of the Job
18 Corps to be a proper charge against the United States, and
19 it is not cognizable under section 2672 of title 28, United
20 States Code, he may adjust and settle it in an amount not
21 exceeding \$500.

22 “(c) Personnel of the uniformed services who are de-
23 tailed or assigned to duty in the performance of agreements
24 made by the Director for the support of the Corps shall not
25 be counted in computing strength under any law limiting

1 the strength of such services or in computing the percentage
2 authorized by law for any grade therein.

3 "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

4 "SEC. 116. (a) The Director shall not use any funds
5 made available to carry out this part for the fiscal year
6 ending June 30, 1968, in a manner that will increase above
7 forty-five thousand the enrollee capacity of Job Corps centers.

8 "(b) The Director shall take necessary action to assure
9 that on or before June 30, 1968, of the total number of
10 Job Corps enrollees in residence and receiving training, at
11 least 25 per centum shall be women.

12 "(c) The Director shall take necessary action to assure
13 that for any fiscal year the direct operating costs of Job
14 Corps centers which have been in operation for more than
15 nine months do not exceed \$7,300 per enrollee.

16 "(d) The Director shall take necessary action to assure
17 that all studies, evaluations, proposals, and data produced
18 or developed with Federal funds in the course of the opera-
19 tion of any conservation or training center shall become the
20 property of the United States.

21 "POLITICAL DISCRIMINATION AND POLITICAL ACTIVITY

22 "SEC. 117. (a) No officer or employee of the executive
23 branch of the Federal Government shall make any inquiry
24 concerning the political affiliation or beliefs of any enrollee

1 or applicant for enrollment in the Corps. All disclosures
2 concerning such matters shall be ignored, except as to such
3 membership in political parties or organizations as constitutes
4 by law a disqualification for Government employment. No
5 discrimination shall be exercised, threatened, or promised by
6 any person in the executive branch of the Federal Govern-
7 ment against or in favor of any enrollee in the Corps, or
8 any applicant for enrollment in the Corps because of his
9 political affiliation or beliefs, except as may be specifically
10 authorized or required by law.

11 “(b) No officer, employee, or enrollee of the Corps shall
12 take any active part in political management or in political
13 campaigns, except as may be provided by or pursuant to
14 statute, and no such officer, employee, or enrollee shall use
15 his official position or influence for the purpose of interfering
16 with an election or affecting the result thereof. All such
17 persons shall retain the right to vote as they may choose and
18 to express, in their private capacities, their opinions on all
19 political subjects and candidates. Any officer, employee,
20 enrollee, or Federal employee who solicits funds for political
21 purposes from members of the Corps, shall be in violation
22 of the Corrupt Practices Act.

23 “(c) Whenever the United States Civil Service Com-
24 mission finds that any person has violated the foregoing pro-
25 visions, it shall, after giving due notice and opportunity for

1 explanation to the officer or employee or enrollee concerned,
 2 certify the facts to the Director with specific instructions as
 3 to discipline or dismissal or other corrective actions.”

4 WORK AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

5 SEC. 102. Part B of title I of the Economic Opportunity
 6 Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

7 “PART B—WORK AND TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS

8 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

9 “SEC. 120. The purpose of this part is to provide useful
 10 work and training opportunities, together with related serv-
 11 ices and assistance, that will assist low-income youths to
 12 continue or resume their education, and to help unemployed
 13 or low-income persons, both young and adult, to obtain and
 14 hold regular competitive employment, with maximum oppor-
 15 tunities for local initiative in developing programs which
 16 respond to local needs and problems, and with emphasis
 17 upon a comprehensive approach which includes programs
 18 using both public and private resources to overcome the
 19 complex problems of the most severely disadvantaged in
 20 urban and rural areas having high concentrations or propor-
 21 tions of unemployment, underemployment, and low income.

22 “COMMUNITY PROGRAM AREAS AND COMPREHENSIVE WORK

23 AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

24 “SEC. 121. (a) The Director shall designate or recog-
 25 nize community program areas for the purpose of planning

1 and conducting comprehensive community work and training
2 programs.

3 “(b) For the purpose of this title, a community may be
4 a city, county, multicity or multicounty unit, an Indian res-
5 ervation, or a neighborhood or other area (irrespective of
6 boundaries or political subdivisions) which provides a suit-
7 able organizational base and possesses the commonality of
8 interest needed for a comprehensive work and training pro-
9 gram. The Director shall consult with the heads of other
10 Federal agencies responsible for programs relating to com-
11 munity action, manpower services physical and economic
12 development, housing, education, health, and other commu-
13 nity services to encourage the establishment of coterminous
14 or complementary boundaries for planning purposes among
15 those programs and comprehensive work and training pro-
16 grams assisted under this title.

17 “(c) A comprehensive work and training program must
18 seek to provide participants an unbroken sequence of serv-
19 ices which will enable them to obtain and hold employment.
20 It shall provide a systematic approach to planning and
21 implementation including the linkage of relevant compo-
22 nent programs authorized by this Act with one another and
23 with other appropriate public and private programs and activ-
24 ities. It shall also provide for evaluation.

1 “PRIME SPONSORS AND DELEGATE AGENCIES

2 “SEC. 122. (a) For each community program area, the
3 Director shall recognize a public or private nonprofit agency
4 which shall serve as the prime sponsor to receive funds under
5 section 123 (except as otherwise provided in section 123
6 (c)). This agency must be capable of planning, adminis-
7 tering, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive work
8 and training program.

9 “(b) The prime sponsor shall be the community action
10 agency unless the Director determines, in accordance with
11 such regulations as he may prescribe, that an alternative
12 prime sponsor is likely to have greater capability in planning
13 and implementing a comprehensive work and training
14 program.

15 “(c) The prime sponsor shall provide for participation
16 of employers and labor organizations in the planning and
17 conduct of the comprehensive work and training programs.

18 “(d) The prime sponsor shall be encouraged to make
19 use of public and private organizations as delegate
20 agencies to carry out components of the comprehen-
21 sive work and training program, including without lim-
22 itation agencies governed with the participation of the
23 poor and other residents of the neighborhoods or rural areas
24 served, educational institutions, the public employment serv-

1 ice, the public welfare agency, other health and welfare
2 agencies, private training institutions, and other capable
3 public and private organizations.

4 “(e) The prime sponsor and delegate agencies shall
5 provide for participation of residents of the area and mem-
6 bers of the groups served in the planning, conduct, and
7 evaluation of the comprehensive work and training program
8 and its components. Such persons shall be provided maximum
9 employment opportunity in the conduct of component pro-
10 grams, including opportunity for further occupational train-
11 ing and career advancement.

12 “(f) The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure
13 that programs under this part have adequate internal admin-
14 istrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel stand-
15 ards, evaluation procedures and other policies as may be
16 necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

17 “ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

18 “SEC. 123. (a) The Director may provide financial as-
19 sistance in urban and rural areas for comprehensive work
20 and training programs or components of such programs,
21 including the following:

22 “(1) programs to provide part-time employment,
23 on-the-job training, and useful work experience for stu-
24 dents from low-income families who are in the ninth
25 through twelfth grades of school (or are of an age equiv-

1 alent to that of students in such grades) and who are in
2 need of the earnings to permit them to resume or main-
3 tain attendance in school;

4 “(2) programs to provide unemployed, underem-
5 ployed, or low-income persons (aged sixteen and over)
6 with useful work and training (which must include
7 sufficient basic education and institutional or on-the-job
8 training) designed to assist those persons to develop
9 their maximum occupational potential and to obtain
10 regular competitive employment;

11 “(3) special programs which involve work ac-
12 tivities directed to the needs of those chronically un-
13 employed poor who have poor employment prospects
14 and are unable, because of age, lack of employment op-
15 portunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employ-
16 ment or training assistance under other programs, and
17 which, in addition to other services provided, will
18 enable such persons to participate in projects for the
19 betterment or beautification of the community or area
20 served by the program, including without limitation
21 activities which will contribute to the management, con-
22 servation, or development of natural resources, recrea-
23 tional areas, Federal, State, and local government parks,
24 highways, and other lands;

25 “(4) special programs which provide unemployed

1 or low-income persons with jobs leading to career oppor-
2 tunities, including new types of careers, in programs
3 designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or
4 cultural condition of the community or area served in
5 fields including without limitation health, education, wel-
6 fare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety,
7 which provide maximum prospects for advancement and
8 continued employment without Federal assistance, which
9 give promise of contributing to the broader adoption
10 of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of
11 providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide
12 opportunities for further occupational training to facili-
13 tate career advancement;

14 “(5) special programs which concentrate work and
15 training resources in urban and rural areas having large
16 concentrations or proportions of low-income, unemployed
17 persons, which are appropriately focused to assure that
18 work and training opportunities are extended to the most
19 severely disadvantaged persons who can reasonably be
20 expected to benefit from such opportunities, and which
21 are supported by specific commitments of cooperation
22 from private and public employers;

23 “(6) supportive and follow-up services to supple-
24 ment work and training programs under this or other
25 Acts including health services, counseling, day care for

1 children, transportation assistance, and other special
2 services necessary to assist individuals to achieve suc-
3 cess in work and training programs and in employment;

4 “(7) employment centers and mobile employment
5 service units to provide recruitment, counseling, and
6 placement services, conveniently located in urban neigh-
7 borhoods and rural areas and easily accessible to the
8 most disadvantaged;

9 “(8) programs to provide incentives to private
10 employers, other than nonprofit organizations, to train
11 or employ unemployed or low-income persons, includ-
12 ing arrangements by direct contract, reimbursements to
13 employers for a limited period when an employee might
14 not be fully productive, payment of on-the-job counsel-
15 ing and other supportive services, payment of all or part
16 of employer costs of sending recruiters into urban and
17 rural areas of high concentrations or proportions of un-
18 employed or low-income persons, and payments to per-
19 mit employers to provide employees resident in such
20 areas with transportation to and from work or to reim-
21 burse such employees for such transportation: *Provided,*
22 That in making such reimbursements to employers the
23 Director shall assure that the wages paid any employee
24 shall not be less than the minimum wage which would

1 be applicable to employment under the Fair Labor
2 Standards Act of 1938 if section 6 of such Act applied
3 to the employee and he was not exempt under section
4 13 thereof; and

5 “(9) means of planning, administering, coordinat-
6 ing, and evaluating a comprehensive work and training
7 program.

8 “(b) Commencing July 1, 1968, all work and training
9 component programs conducted in a community under this
10 section shall be consolidated into the comprehensive work
11 and training program and financial assistance for such com-
12 ponents shall be provided to the prime sponsor unless the
13 Director determines there is a good cause for providing an
14 extension of time, except as otherwise provided by subsec-
15 tion (c). After that date, the work and training components
16 of programs authorized by section 502 of this Act and by
17 section 261 of part E of title II of the Manpower Develop-
18 ment and Training Act of 1962 shall to the maximum extent
19 feasible be linked to the comprehensive work and training
20 program, including funding through the prime sponsor
21 where appropriate.

22 “(c) The Director may provide financial assistance to
23 a public agency or private organization other than a prime
24 sponsor to carry out one or more component programs
25 described in subsection (a) when he determines, after solic-

1 iting and considering comments of the prime sponsor, if
2 any, that such assistance would enhance program effective-
3 ness or acceptance on the part of persons served and would
4 serve the purposes of this title. In the case of programs under
5 subsection (a) (1) to this section, financial assistance may
6 be provided directly to local or State educational agencies
7 pursuant to agreements between the Director and the Secre-
8 tary of Labor providing for the operation of such programs
9 under direct grants or contracts.

10 "SPECIAL CONDITIONS

11 "SEC. 124. (a) The Director shall not provide financial
12 assistance for any program under this part unless he deter-
13 mines, in accordance with such regulations as he may pre-
14 scribe, that—

15 "(1) no participant will be employed on projects
16 involving political parties, or the construction, opera-
17 tion, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is
18 used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place
19 for religious worship;

20 "(2) the program will not result in the displace-
21 ment of employed workers or impair existing contracts
22 for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for
23 other funds in connection with work that would other-
24 wise be performed;

25 "(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-

1 training and education, and other conditions of employ-
2 ment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light
3 of such factors as the type of work, geographical region,
4 and proficiency of the participant;

5 “(4) the program will, to the maximum extent
6 feasible, contribute to the occupational development or
7 upward mobility of individual participants.

8 “(b) For programs which provide work and training
9 related to physical improvements, preference shall be given
10 to those improvements which will be substantially used by
11 low-income persons and families or which will contribute
12 substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas
13 having high concentrations or proportions of low-income
14 persons and families.

15 “(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the
16 maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of
17 artificial barriers to employment and occupational advance-
18 ment.

19 “(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maxi-
20 mum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs
21 for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

22 “PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

23 “SEC. 125. (a) Participants in programs under this part
24 must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director,
25 in consultation with the Social Security Administrator, shall

1 establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration
2 family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and
3 other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be
4 from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare
5 payments.

6 “(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the
7 United States.

8 “(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal em-
9 ployees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law
10 relating to Federal employment, including those relating to
11 hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment
12 compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

13 “ELDERLY

14 “SEC. 126. The Director shall provide that programs
15 under this part shall be designed to deal with the incidence
16 of long-term unemployment among persons fifty-five years
17 and older. In the conduct of such programs, the Director
18 shall encourage the employment of such persons as regular,
19 part-time, and short-term staff in component programs.

20 “PILOT PROJECTS

21 “SEC. 127. (a) The Director may provide financial
22 assistance to public or private organizations for pilot projects
23 which are designed to develop new approaches to further the
24 objectives of this part. Such projects may be conducted by
25 public agencies or private organizations.

1 “(b) The Director shall undertake pilot projects de-
2 signed to encourage the maximum participation of private
3 employers, other than nonprofit organizations, in work and
4 training programs under this part.

5 “(c) Before the Director may approve a pilot project,
6 he shall solicit and consider comments on such project from
7 the prime sponsor, if any, in the community where the
8 project will be undertaken.

9 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

10 “SEC. 128. The Director may provide (directly or
11 through contracts or other appropriate arrangements) tech-
12 nical assistance to assist in the initiation or effective opera-
13 tion of programs under this part. He may also make arrange-
14 ments for the training of instructors and other personnel
15 needed to carry out work and training programs under this
16 part and part D of this title. He shall give special considera-
17 tion to the problems of rural areas.

18 “ROLE OF THE STATES

19 “SEC. 129. The Director may provide financial assistance
20 to appropriate State agencies to—

21 “(1) provide technical assistance and training, as
22 authorized by section 128, with particular emphasis upon
23 service to rural areas and for this purpose preference
24 shall be given to the State agency which administers
25 programs assisted by section 231;

1 “(2) assist in coordinating State activities related
2 to this part;

3 “(3) operate work and training programs in com-
4 munities which have not yet established an acceptable
5 prime sponsor; and

6 “(4) provide work and training opportunities on
7 State projects and in State agencies: *Provided*, That
8 these opportunities shall be made available to partici-
9 pants in community work and training programs.

10 “EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

11 “SEC. 130. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for
12 any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the
13 Director shall reserve not to exceed 20 per centum for the
14 purpose of carrying out section 123 (a) (5) ; but not more
15 than $12\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the funds so reserved for any fiscal
16 year shall be used within any one State. With respect to the
17 remaining funds appropriated or allocated to carry out the
18 provisions of section 123, the Director shall establish criteria
19 designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance
20 among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall con-
21 sider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population,
22 unemployment, and family income levels.

23 “LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

24 “SEC. 131. Federal financial assistance to any program
25 or activity carried out pursuant to section 123 of this part

1 shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of such program
2 or activity, including costs of administration. The Director
3 may, however, approve assistance in excess of that percent-
4 age if he determines, pursuant to regulations establishing ob-
5 jective criteria for such determinations, that this is necessary
6 in furtherance of the purposes of this part. Non-Federal con-
7 tributions may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, includ-
8 ing but not limited to plant, equipment, and services. If in
9 any fiscal year, a community provides non-Federal contribu-
10 tions under this title exceeding its requirements under this
11 section, such excess may be used to meet its requirements for
12 such contributions under section 224 (c) .

13 "PROGRAM DATA AND EVALUATION

14 "SEC. 132. (a) The Director shall provide for the devel-
15 opment and implementation of a program data system con-
16 sistent with similar data systems for other relevant Federal
17 programs. Such data shall be published periodically.

18 "(b) The Director shall provide for the continuing eval-
19 uation of the programs under this part, including their effec-
20 tiveness in achieving stated goals, their impact on related
21 programs, and their structure and mechanisms for the de-
22 livery of services, and he shall arrange for obtaining the
23 opinions of participants about the strengths and weak-
24 nesses of the programs. This evaluation shall include com-
25 parisons with proper control groups composed of persons

1 who have not participated in such programs, and shall seek
2 to develop comparative data on the costs and benefits of
3 work and training programs authorized by this Act and by
4 other Acts, including the Manpower Development and
5 Training Act of 1962. He may, for this purpose, contract
6 for independent evaluations of such programs or individual
7 projects. The results of such evaluations shall be included
8 in the report required by section 608.

9 “(c) The Director shall develop and publish standards
10 for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the
11 objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered
12 in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial as-
13 sistance provided by sections 123, 128, and 129.”

14 SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

15 SEC. 103. Part D of title I of the Economic Opportu-
16 nity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

17 “PART D—SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAMS

18 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

19 “SEC. 150. The purpose of this part is to establish
20 special programs which (1) are directed to the solution of
21 the critical problems existing in particular communities or
22 neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other
23 subdivisions or boundaries) within those urban areas having
24 especially large concentrations of low-income persons, and
25 within those rural areas having substantial out-migration to

1 eligible urban areas, and (2) are of sufficient size and scope
2 to have an appreciable impact in such communities and
3 neighborhoods in arresting tendencies toward dependency,
4 chronic unemployment, and rising community tensions.

5 "ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAMS

6 "SEC. 151. The Director is authorized to provide finan-
7 cial assistance to public agencies or private organizations
8 for the payment of all or part of the costs of programs
9 which are designed to carry out the purposes of this part.
10 Such programs shall be restricted in number so that each
11 is of sufficient size and scope to have an appreciable impact
12 on the area served. Such programs may include—

13 "(1) economic and business development pro-
14 grams, including programs which provide financial and
15 other incentives to business to locate in or near the areas
16 served so as to provide employment opportunities for
17 residents of those areas, and programs such as those
18 described in title IV of this Act for small businesses
19 in or owned by residents of such areas;

20 "(2) community development activities which
21 create new training and employment opportunities and
22 which contribute to an improved living environment;
23 and

24 "(3) manpower training programs for unemployed
25 or low-income persons which support and complement

1 economic, business, and community development pro-
2 grams, including without limitation activities such as
3 those described in part B of this title.

4 “REQUIREMENTS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

5 “SEC. 152. (a) The Director shall not provide finan-
6 cial assistance for any program or component project under
7 this part unless he determines that—

8 “(1) all projects and related facilities will, to the
9 maximum feasible extent, be located in the area served;

10 “(2) projects will, where feasible, promote the
11 development of entrepreneurial and management skills
12 and the ownership or participation in ownership of as-
13 sisted businesses by residents of the area served;

14 “(3) projects will be planned and carried out with
15 the maximum participation of local businessmen by their
16 inclusion on program boards of directors, advisory coun-
17 cils, or through other appropriate means;

18 “(4) the program will be appropriately coordinated
19 with local planning under this Act, the Demonstration
20 Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, and
21 with other relevant plans for physical and human re-
22 sources of the areas served;

23 “(5) the requirements of subsections 122 (f) and
24 124 (a) of this Act have been met; and

1 “(6) preference will be given to the residents of
2 the areas served in filling jobs and training oppor-
3 tunities.

4 “(b) Financial assistance under this section shall not
5 be extended to assist in the relocation of establishments from
6 one location to another if such relocation would result in an
7 increase in unemployment in the area of original location.

8 “(c) The level of financial assistance for related pur-
9 poses under this Act to the area served by a special impact
10 program shall not be diminished in order to substitute funds
11 authorized by this part.

12 “(d) Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal
13 year for programs authorized under this title, the Director
14 shall reserve not less than 8 per centum for the purpose
15 of carrying out this part.

16 “APPLICATION OF OTHER FEDERAL RESOURCES

17 “SEC. 153. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban
18 Development shall, in consultation with the Director, take
19 all necessary steps under the authority granted to him under
20 title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to assure that land for
21 business location and expansion purposes is made available
22 as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this part.

23 “(b) Areas selected for assistance under this part shall
24 be deemed ‘redevelopment areas’ within the meaning of
25 section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Develop-

1 ment Act of 1965 and shall qualify for assistance under the
2 provisions of title II of that Act.

3 “(c) The Director shall take such steps as may be
4 necessary and appropriate, in coordination and cooperation
5 with the heads of other Federal departments and agencies, so
6 that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits made by the Fed-
7 eral Government or in connection with programs aided with
8 Federal funds are placed in such a way as to further the
9 purposes of this part.

10 “EVALUATION

11 “SEC. 154. Each program for which payments are made
12 under section 151 shall provide for a thorough evaluation
13 of the effectiveness of the program in achieving the goals of
14 this part. This evaluation shall be conducted by such public
15 or private organizations as the Director may designate, and
16 up to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid
17 from funds appropriated to carry out this part. The results of
18 such evaluations or a summary of them, together with the
19 Director's findings and recommendations concerning the pro-
20 gram, shall be included in the report required by section 608.

21 “FEDERAL SHARE OF PROGRAM COSTS

22 “SEC. 155. Federal grants to any program carried out
23 pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the
24 cost of such program, including costs of administration, unless
25 the Director determines, pursuant to regulations adopted

1 and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for
 2 such determinations, that assistance in excess of such per-
 3 centage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this
 4 part. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in kind,
 5 fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equip-
 6 ment, and services: *Provided*, That where capital investment
 7 is required under a contract with a private organization
 8 (other than a nonprofit organization), the Federal share
 9 thereof shall not exceed 90 per centum of such capital invest-
 10 ment and the non-Federal share shall be as defined above.

11 COMMUNITY ACTION AMENDMENTS

12 SEC. 104. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of
 13 1964 is amended to read as follows:

14 "TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY 15 ACTION PROGRAMS

16 "STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

17 "SEC. 201. The purpose of this title is to assist com-
 18 munities in opening opportunities which enable low-income
 19 persons to achieve self-sufficiency.

20 "COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

21 "SEC. 202. (a) To achieve this purpose, communities
 22 shall be encouraged and aided to plan and conduct com-
 23 munity action programs designed to—

24 "(1) provide services and assistance, including in-
 25 novative approaches, which enable low-income persons

1 to achieve economic independence, to improve their
2 living conditions, and to increase their participation in
3 community activities;

4 “(2) stimulate agencies and institutions which pro-
5 vide services and assistance to low-income persons to
6 expand, modify, and improve their programs so as to
7 serve such persons more effectively; and

8 “(3) mobilize, utilize, and coordinate all relevant
9 Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all
10 available private resources in a comprehensive program
11 which opens opportunities to low-income persons.

12 “(b) There shall be maximum feasible participation of
13 residents of the areas and members of the groups served in
14 the planning, conduct, administration, and evaluation of all
15 components of a community action program. There shall be
16 maximum emphasis upon local initiative and responsibility.

17 “PART A—COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES AND DELE-
18 GATE AGENCIES

19 “ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCIES

20 “SEC. 210. The Director shall encourage the formation
21 of community action agencies. A community action agency
22 may be either a public or private nonprofit agency. In order
23 to merit financial assistance under this title, a community ac-
24 tion agency shall be responsible for and must be capable of
25 planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating a com-

1 munity action program, and, to the extent permitted by
2 relevant law, be capable of mobilizing all Federal, State, and
3 local public resources, as well as all available private re-
4 sources. It shall serve as the prime sponsor for all financial
5 assistance provided to its community under sections 220
6 and 221 (except as otherwise provided in sections 220 (c)
7 and 221 (a)). It shall have adequate authority (1) to
8 administer funds received under this title and from other
9 public and private sources, (2) to transfer and delegate such
10 funds to other agencies, and (3) to contract with public or
11 private organizations. It shall conform to such other criteria
12 as the Director may prescribe consistent with the provisions
13 of this title.

14 "COMMUNITIES

15 "SEC. 211. For the purpose of this title, a community
16 may be a city, county, multicity, or multicounty unit, an
17 Indian reservation, or a neighborhood or other area (irre-
18 spective of boundaries or political subdivisions) which pro-
19 vides a suitable organizational base and possesses the com-
20 monality of interest needed for a community action program.
21 The Director shall consult with the heads of other Federal
22 agencies responsible for programs relating to work and train-
23 ing programs, physical and economic development, housing,
24 education, health, and other community services to encour-
25 age the establishment of coterminous or complementary

1 boundaries for planning purposes among those programs and
2 community action programs assisted under this title.

3 "STATEWIDE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

4 "SEC. 212. A statewide or regional agency may be a
5 community action agency for the purpose of planning, con-
6 ducting, administering and evaluating programs in a number
7 of rural areas or small communities until a satisfactory com-
8 munity agency is established. Such an agency must operate
9 in a manner consistent with sections 201 and 202, including
10 the participation and representation requirements of sec-
11 tion 213.

12 "GOVERNING BOARD

13 "SEC. 213. (a) Each community action agency shall be
14 established and maintained so as to assure broad, continuing,
15 and effective community participation in all phases of the
16 community action program for which it is responsible, and
17 to assure that the program, as developed and implemented,
18 is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each
19 such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board
20 whose members shall, if he or they so desire, include the
21 chief elected official or officials of the community, or on the
22 failure of any such official to serve, a person or persons
23 may be designated by such official and other appropriate
24 public officials or their representatives, and representatives

1 of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assist-
2 ance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of busi-
3 ness, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests
4 in the community.

5 “(b) At least one-third of the membership of the board
6 shall be persons who are selected by residents of the areas
7 and members of the groups served. Each community action
8 agency shall establish procedures by which appropriate rep-
9 resentation is provided (1) to poor persons living in neigh-
10 borhoods where poverty is concentrated, and (2) to other
11 poor persons including the elderly and rural residents living
12 outside these neighborhoods. All members of the governing
13 board selected to represent specific geographic areas must
14 reside in the area they represent.

15 “(c) The Director shall require community action agen-
16 cies to establish procedures under which community agencies
17 and representative groups of the poor which feel themselves
18 inadequately represented on the governing board may peti-
19 tion for adequate representation.

20 “POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNING BOARD

21 “SEC. 214. (a) The governing board of a community
22 action agency shall be empowered to—

23 “(1) establish adequate personnel policies and fis-
24 cal controls;

25 “(2) approve overall plans, adopt and enforce pro-

1 gram policies, and approve all proposals for financial
2 assistance under this title; and

3 “(3) provide for periodic evaluation of the effective-
4 ness of the community action program and its com-
5 ponents.

6 “(b) Each community action agency shall provide for
7 reasonable public access to books, records and other informa-
8 tion and for opportunity for public hearing at the request of
9 local groups.

10 “(c) The Director shall promulgate such standards or
11 rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings,
12 quorums, procedures, establishment of committees and simi-
13 lar matters as he may deem necessary to assure that com-
14 munity action boards provide a continuing and effective
15 mechanism for securing broad, community involvement in
16 programs assisted under this title and that all groups or
17 elements represented on those boards have a full and fair
18 opportunity to participate in decisions affecting those
19 programs.

20 “DELEGATE AGENCIES

21 “SEC. 215. (a) Each community action agency shall be
22 encouraged to make use of delegate agencies to carry out
23 components of the community action program. Such agencies
24 shall consist of (1) neighborhood based organizations formed
25 to carry out programs under this Act, which shall be encour-

1 aged to have at least one-half of the governing board com-
2 posed of residents of the area or members of the groups
3 served, or (2) other delegate agencies which shall be re-
4 quired to establish effective procedures by which such persons
5 will be enabled to influence the character of programs affect-
6 ing their interests. A delegate agency may be a public
7 agency or private organization. Each delegate agency must
8 be capable of conducting the program or programs, shall
9 have adequate personnel policies and fiscal controls, shall
10 provide for reasonable public access to books, records, and
11 other information, and shall cooperate in the evaluation of
12 programs.

13 “(b) The community action agency shall encourage the
14 establishment of housing development and services organi-
15 zations designed to focus on the housing needs of low-income
16 families and individuals. Such organizations shall provide the
17 technical, administrative, and financial assistance which is
18 required to help low-income families and individuals more
19 effectively to utilize existing programs, and which is required
20 to enable nonprofit, cooperative, and public sponsors more
21 effectively to take advantage of existing Federal, State, and
22 local mortgage insurance and housing assistance programs.
23 Where appropriate, such organizations may be nonprofit
24 housing development corporations. Such corporations may
25 themselves become sponsors of housing under existing pro-

grams of specialized housing agencies, but under no circumstances shall such corporations insure mortgages or duplicate the long-term capital financing functions of programs now administered by the specialized housing agencies. Housing development and service organizations shall coordinate their efforts with other community action agency efforts so that any programs undertaken under authority of this subsection shall be closely related to other community action programs.

“PART B—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY

ACTION PROGRAMS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

“GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

“SEC. 220. (a) The Director may provide financial assistance to community action agencies for the planning, conduct, administration and evaluation of community action programs and components. Those components may involve national emphasis program activities as described in section 221 and, without limitation, other activities and supporting facilities designed to assist participants including the elderly poor—

“(1) to secure and retain meaningful employment;

“(2) to attain an adequate education;

“(3) to make better use of available income;

“(4) to provide and maintain adequate housing and a suitable living environment;

“(5) to undertake family planning, consistent

1 with personal and family goals, religious and moral
2 convictions;

3 “(6) to obtain services for the prevention of
4 narcotics addiction, alcoholism, and the rehabilitation of
5 narcotic addicts and alcoholics;

6 “(7) to obtain emergency assistance through loans
7 or grants to meet immediate and urgent individual and
8 family needs, including the need for health services,
9 nutritious food, housing, and employment-related as-
10 sistance;

11 “(8) to remove obstacles and solve personal and
12 family problems which block the achievement of self-
13 sufficiency;

14 “(9) to achieve greater participation in the affairs
15 of the community; and

16 “(10) to make more frequent and effective use of
17 other programs related to the purposes of this title.

18 He may also provide financial assistance to other public or
19 private non-profit agencies to aid them in planning for the
20 establishment of a community action agency.

21 “(b) After July 1, 1968, the Director shall require, as
22 a condition of assistance, that each community action agency
23 has adopted a systematic approach to the achievement of
24 the purposes of this title and to the utilization of funds pro-
25 vided under this part. Such systematic approach shall en-

1 compass a planning and implementation process which seeks
2 to identify the problems and causes of poverty in the com-
3 munity, seeks to mobilize and coordinate relevant public and
4 private resources, establishes program priorities, links pro-
5 gram components with one another and with other relevant
6 programs, and provides for evaluation. The Director may,
7 however, extend the time for such requirement to take into
8 account the length of time a program has been in operation.
9 He shall also take necessary steps to assure the participation
10 of other Federal agencies in support of the development and
11 implementation of plans under this subsection.

12 “(c) The Director may and is encouraged to provide
13 financial assistance to a public agency or private organization
14 other than a community action agency to carry out one or
15 more component programs under this section and section 221
16 when he determines, after soliciting and considering com-
17 ments of the community action agency, if any, that such
18 assistance would enhance program participation or accept-
19 ance on the part of persons served and would serve the pur-
20 poses of this title.

21 “(d) At least 50 per centum of the funds authorized
22 and appropriated for this title shall be utilized to finance
23 component programs under this section and section 221
24 which are locally selected to respond to particular com-
25 munity needs.

1 “(e) In order to promote local responsibility and ini-
2 tiative, the Director shall not establish binding national
3 priorities on funds authorized by this section, but he shall re-
4 view each application for financial assistance on its merits.
5 Before extending financial assistance to a new community
6 action agency under this section and under section 221, and
7 in determining the amount of and conditions on which such
8 assistance shall be extended, the Director shall consider the
9 extent and nature of poverty in the community and the
10 probable capacity of the agency to carry out an effective
11 program. In reviewing or supplementing financial assistance
12 to a previously existing community action agency, he shall
13 consider the progress made in carrying on programs by such
14 agency.

15 “NATIONAL EMPHASIS PROGRAMS

16 “SEC. 221. (a) The Director may reserve funds and
17 provide financial assistance for national emphasis programs
18 designed to deal with needs of the poor which are common
19 to a number of communities. Except as otherwise provided in
20 subsections (b) (2) and (b) (5) and section 220 (c), such
21 financial assistance shall be provided through community
22 action agencies, unless (1) the community action agency
23 chooses not to undertake that responsibility, or (2) the com-
24 munity action agency fails to demonstrate affirmatively its
25 capability to undertake this responsibility, or (3) there is no

1 community action agency in the area. Community action
2 agencies shall be encouraged to make maximum use of dele-
3 gate agencies to operate such programs.

4 “(b) Among the national emphasis programs shall be
5 the following:

6 “(1) A program to be known as Headstart focused
7 upon children who have not reached the age of compulsory
8 school attendance which will provide such comprehensive
9 health, nutritional, education, social, and other services, as
10 the Director finds will aid the children to attain their full
11 potential, together with appropriate activities to encourage
12 the participation of parents of such children and permit the
13 effective use of parent services.

14 “(2) A program to be known as Follow Through
15 focused primarily upon children in kindergarten or ele-
16 mentary school who were previously enrolled in Headstart
17 or similar programs and designed to provide comprehensive
18 services and parent participation activities as described in
19 paragraph (1), which the Director finds will aid in the con-
20 tinued development of children to their full potential. Funds
21 for such program shall be transferred directly from the
22 Director to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.
23 Financial assistance for such projects shall be provided by
24 the Secretary on the basis of agreements reached with the

1 Director directly to local educational agencies except as
2 otherwise provided by such agreements.

3 “(3) A ‘legal services program’ to further the cause of
4 justice among persons living in poverty by mobilizing the
5 assistance of lawyers and legal institutions and by providing
6 legal advice, legal representation, counseling education, and
7 other appropriate services. Projects involving legal advice
8 and representation shall be carried on in a way that assures
9 maintenance of a lawyer-client relationship consistent with
10 the best standards of the legal profession. The Director shall
11 make arrangements under which the State bar association
12 and the local bar association in the community to be served
13 by any proposed project authorized by this paragraph shall
14 be consulted and afforded an adequate opportunity to sub-
15 mit, to the Director, comments and recommendations on the
16 proposed project before such project is approved or funded,
17 and to submit, to the Director, comments and recommenda-
18 tions on the operations of such project, if approved and
19 funded.

20 “(4) A ‘comprehensive health services program’. This
21 shall include—

22 “(A) programs to aid in developing and carrying
23 out comprehensive health services projects focused upon
24 the needs of urban and rural areas having high concen-
25 trations or proportions of poverty and marked inade-

quacy of health services for the poor. These projects shall be designed—

“(i) to make possible, with maximum feasible use of existing agencies and resources, the provision of comprehensive health services, such as preventive medical, diagnostic, treatment, rehabilitation, family planning, narcotic addiction and alcoholism prevention and rehabilitation, mental health, dental, and followup services, together with necessary related facilities and services; and

“(ii) to assure that these services are made readily accessible to low-income residents of such areas, are furnished in a manner most responsive to their needs and with their participation and wherever possible are combined with, or included within, arrangements for providing employment, education, social, or other assistance needed by the families and individuals served: *Provided, however, That* such services may be made available on an emergency basis or pending a determination of eligibility to all residents of such areas.

Funds for financial assistance under this paragraph shall be allotted according to need, and capacity of applicants to make rapid and effective use of that assistance, and may be used, as necessary to pay the full costs of projects.

1 Before approving any project, the Director shall solicit
2 and consider the comments and recommendations of the
3 principal local medical associations in the area and shall
4 consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local health
5 agencies and take such steps as may be required to assure
6 that the program will be carried on under competent
7 professional supervision and that existing agencies pro-
8 viding related services are furnished all assistance needed
9 to permit them to plan for participation in the program
10 and for the necessary continuation of those related serv-
11 ices; and

12 “(B) programs to provide financial assistance to
13 public or private agencies for projects designed to de-
14 velop knowledge or enhance skills in the field of health
15 services for the poor. Such projects shall encourage both
16 prospective and practicing health professionals to direct
17 their talents and energies toward providing health serv-
18 ices for the poor. In carrying out the provisions of this
19 paragraph, the Director is authorized to provide or ar-
20 range for training and study in the field of health serv-
21 ices for the poor. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by
22 him, the Director may arrange for the payment of
23 stipends and allowances (including travel and subsist-
24 ence expenses) for persons undergoing such training
25 and study and for their dependents. The Director and

1 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall
2 achieve effective coordination of programs and projects
3 authorized under this section with other related
4 activities.

5 “(5) A program to be known as Upward Bound de-
6 signed to generate skills and motivation necessary for suc-
7 cess in education beyond high school among young people
8 from low-income backgrounds and inadequate secondary
9 school preparation. Projects must include arrangements to
10 assure cooperation among one or more institutions of higher
11 education and one or more secondary schools. They must in-
12 clude a curriculum designed to develop creative thinking,
13 effective expression and attitudes toward learning needed for
14 post-secondary educational success, necessary health services
15 and such recreational and cultural and group activities as the
16 Director determines may be appropriate. Financial assist-
17 ance for such projects may be provided directly to institu-
18 tions of higher learning, but the projects shall be closely
19 coordinated with activities of community action agencies
20 and with the Higher Education Act of 1965.

21 “(6) A program to be known as Project Find designed
22 to identify and meet the needs of poor persons above the
23 age of 60 in one or more of the following areas: effective
24 referral to existing health, welfare, employment, housing,
25 legal and consumer assistance, recreation, and other services;

1 stimulation of additional services and programs to remedy
2 gaps and deficiencies in presently existing services and pro-
3 grams; provision of new employment and volunteer op-
4 portunities; increased participation in community activities
5 and programs; modification of existing procedures and eligi-
6 bility requirements to facilitate greater use of and participa-
7 tion in public services by the older poor; development of
8 all-season recreation centers; and such other activities and
9 services as the Director may determine are necessary or
10 specially appropriate to meet the needs of the older poor.

11 “(7) A ‘family planning program’ to provide assist-
12 ance and services to low-income persons in the field of vol-
13 untary family planning, including the provision of infor-
14 mation, medical assistance, and supplies. The Director and
15 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall co-
16 ordinate, and assure a full exchange of information concern-
17 ing, family planning projects within their respective juris-
18 dictions in order to assure the maximum availability of
19 services and in order best to meet the varying needs of dif-
20 ferent communities. The Secretary of Health, Education,
21 and Welfare shall make the services of Public Health
22 Services officers available to the Director in carrying out this
23 program.

24 “(c) Consistent with, and subject, to the provisions of
25 section 232, programs under this section may include related

1 training, research, and technical assistance, and funds allo-
2 cated for this purpose may be allotted and used in the
3 manner otherwise provided under this title with respect to
4 training, research, and technical assistance activities.

5 "RESIDENT EMPLOYMENT

6 "SEC. 222. In the conduct of all component programs
7 under this part, residents of the area and members of the
8 groups served shall be provided maximum employment op-
9 portunity, including opportunity for further occupational
10 training and career advancement. The Director shall encour-
11 age the employment of persons fifty-five years and older as
12 regular, part-time and short-term staff in component
13 programs.

14 "NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS

15 "SEC. 223. The Director shall encourage the develop-
16 ment of neighborhood centers, designed to promote the effec-
17 tiveness of needed services in such fields as health, educa-
18 tion, manpower, consumer protection, child and economic
19 development, housing, legal, recreation, and social services,
20 and so organized (through a corporate or other appropriate
21 framework) as to promote maximum participation of neigh-
22 borhood residents in center planning, policymaking, adminis-
23 tration, and operation. In addition to providing such services
24 as may not otherwise be conveniently or readily available,
25 such centers shall be responsive to such neighborhood needs

1 as counseling, referral, follow-through, and community devel-
2 opment activities as may be necessary or appropriate to best
3 assure a system under which existing programs are extended
4 to the most disadvantaged, are linked to one another, are
5 responsive and relevant to the range of community, family,
6 and individual problems and are fully adapted to neighbor-
7 hood needs and conditions.

8 “ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS; LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

9 “SEC. 224. (a) Of the sums which are appropriated or
10 allocated for assistance in the development and implementa-
11 tion of community action programs pursuant to section 220
12 and for national emphasis programs referred to in section
13 221 (a), and which are not subject to any other provision
14 governing allotment or distribution, the Director shall allot
15 not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam,
16 American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands,
17 and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs.
18 He shall also reserve not more than 20 per centum of those
19 sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and
20 procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be
21 allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest
22 available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on
23 the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance
24 recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the
25 average number of unemployed persons in each State as

1 compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of
2 related children living with families with incomes of less
3 than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. That
4 part of any State allotment which the Director determines
5 will not be needed may be reallocated, on such dates during
6 the fiscal year as the Director may fix, to other States, in
7 proportion to their original allotments, but with appropriate
8 adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to
9 any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among
10 the other States.

11 “(b) The Director may provide for the separate allot-
12 ment of funds for any national emphasis program referred to
13 in section 221 (a) except Headstart. This allotment may be
14 made in accordance with the criteria prescribed in subsec-
15 tion (a), or it may be made in accordance with criteria
16 which he determines will assure an equitable distribution of
17 funds reflecting the relative incidence in each State of the
18 needs or problems at which the program is directed, except
19 that in no event may more than $12\frac{1}{2}$ per centum of the funds
20 for any one program be used in any one State.

21 “(c) Unless otherwise provided in this part, financial
22 assistance extended to a community action agency or other
23 agency pursuant to sections 220 and 221 shall not exceed
24 90 per centum of the approved cost of the assisted pro-

1 grams or activities. The Director may, however, approve
2 assistance in excess of such percentage if he determines, in
3 accordance with regulations establishing objective criteria,
4 that such action is required in furtherance of the purposes
5 of this title. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or in
6 kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant,
7 equipment, or services. If in any fiscal year, a community
8 provides non-Federal contributions under this title exceed-
9 ing its requirements under this section, such excess may be
10 used to meet its requirements for such contributions under
11 section 131.

12 “(d) No program shall be approved for assistance under
13 sections 220 and 221, unless the Director satisfies himself
14 (1) that the services to be provided under such program
15 will be in addition to, and not in substitution for, services
16 previously provided without Federal assistance, (2) that,
17 to the extent that in-school educational services previously
18 provided with or without Federal assistance can be expanded
19 and adapted to meet more effectively (A) the needs of the
20 poor within the community and (B) the purposes of the
21 assistance to be extended under this title, the agency provid-
22 ing such services shall be utilized, and (3) that funds or
23 other resources devoted to programs designed to meet the
24 needs of the poor within the community will not be di-
25 minished in order to provide any contributions required
26 under subsection (c) or otherwise qualify for assistance

1 under this part. The requirement imposed by the preceding
2 sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director
3 may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for
4 determinations covering situations where a strict applica-
5 tion of that requirement would result in unnecessary hardship
6 or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be
7 achieved.

8 “PART C—SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES

9 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

10 “SEC. 230. The Director may provide, directly or
11 through grants or other arrangements, (1) technical assist-
12 ance to communities in planning, conducting, administering,
13 and evaluating programs under this title, and (2) training
14 of specialized or other personnel which are needed to achieve
15 the purposes of this title. Upon request of an agency receiv-
16 ing financial assistance under this title, the Director may
17 make special assignments of personnel to the agency to assist
18 and advise it in the performance of functions related to the
19 assisted activity; but no such special assignment shall be for
20 a period of more than two years in the case of any agency.

21 “STATE AGENCY ASSISTANCE—SUBMISSION OF PLANS TO
22 GOVERNORS

23 “SEC. 231. (a) The Director may provide financial as-
24 sistance to appropriate State agencies to enable those
25 agencies—

1 “(1) to provide technical assistance to communi-
2 ties and local agencies in developing and carrying out
3 programs under this title;

4 “(2) to assist in coordinating State activities related
5 to this title;

6 “(3) to advise and assist the Director in develop-
7 ing procedures and programs to promote the participa-
8 tion of States and State agencies in programs under this
9 title; and

10 “(4) to advise and assist the Director, the Eco-
11 nomic Opportunity Council established by section 631
12 of the Act, and the heads of other Federal agencies, in
13 identifying problems posed by Federal statutory or ad-
14 ministrative requirements that operate to impede State
15 level coordination of programs related to this title, and
16 in developing methods or recommendations for overcom-
17 ing those problems.

18 “(b) In any grants or contracts with State agencies, the
19 Director shall give preference to programs or activities which
20 are administered or coordinated by the agencies assisted pur-
21 suant to subsection (a), or which have been developed and
22 will be carried on with the assistance of those agencies.

23 “(c) In order to promote coordination in the use of
24 funds under this Act and funds provided or granted by State
25 agencies, the Director may enter into agreements with States

1 or State agencies pursuant to which they will act as agents of
2 the United States for purposes of providing financial assist-
3 ance to community action agencies or other local agencies
4 in connection with specific projects or types of projects in-
5 volving the common or joint use of State funds and funds
6 under this title.

7 “(d) In carrying out the provisions of part B of title I
8 and title II no contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other as-
9 sistance shall be made with, or provided to, any State or local
10 public agency or any private institution or organization for
11 the purpose of carrying out any program, project, or other ac-
12 tivity within a State unless a plan setting forth such proposed
13 contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance has been
14 submitted to the Governor of the State, and such plan has
15 not been disapproved by the Governor within thirty days of
16 such submission, or, if so disapproved, has been reconsidered
17 by the Director and found by him to be fully consistent with
18 the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of this part.
19 This section shall not, however, apply to contracts, agree-
20 ments, grants, loans, or other assistance to any institution of
21 higher education in existence on the date of the approval of
22 this Act.

23 “RESEARCH AND PILOT PROJECTS

24 “SEC. 232. (a) The Director may provide financial
25 assistance for pilot projects conducted by public agencies or

1 private organizations which are designed to assist in the
2 development of new approaches that will aid in furthering
3 the purposes of this title. He may also contract or provide
4 financial assistance for research pertaining to the purposes
5 of this title.

6 “(b) Before approving any contract or grant for a pilot
7 project in a community which has a community action
8 agency, the Director shall solicit and consider the views of
9 that agency on the proposed project.

10 “(c) The Director shall develop and carry out pilot
11 projects (1) which aid elderly persons to achieve greater
12 self-sufficiency, (2) which focus upon the problems of rural
13 poverty, (3) which are designed to develop new techniques
14 and community-based efforts to prevent narcotics addiction
15 or to rehabilitate narcotic addicts, and (4) which are de-
16 signed to encourage the participation of private organizations,
17 other than nonprofit organizations, in programs under this
18 title.

19 “(d) The Director shall conduct, either directly or
20 through grants or other arrangements, research and pilot
21 projects designed to assure a more effective use of human
22 and natural resources of rural America and to slow the migra-
23 tion from rural areas due to lack of economic opportunity,
24 thereby reducing population pressures in urban centers.
25 Such projects may be operated jointly or in cooperation with
26 other federally assisted programs, particularly programs au-

1 thorized under the Public Works and Economic Develop-
2 ment Act of 1965, in the area to be served by the project.

3 “(e) The Director shall establish an overall plan to gov-
4 ern the approval of pilot or demonstration projects and the
5 use of all research authority under this title. The plan shall
6 set forth specific objectives to be achieved and priorities
7 among such objectives. In formulating the plan, the Director
8 shall consult with other Federal agencies for the purpose of
9 minimizing duplication among similar activities or projects
10 and determining whether the findings resulting from any re-
11 search or pilot projects may be incorporated into one or more
12 programs for which those agencies are responsible. As part
13 of the annual report required by section 608, or in a separate
14 annual report, the Director shall submit a description for
15 each fiscal year of the current plan required by this section,
16 of activities subject to the plan, and of the findings derived
17 from those activities, together with a statement indicating the
18 time and, to the extent feasible, the manner in which the
19 benefits of those activities and findings are expected to be
20 realized.

21 “(f) Not more than 15 per centum of the sums appro-
22 priated or allocated in any fiscal year for this title shall be
23 used for the purposes of this section. Notwithstanding any
24 other provision of law, of the sums appropriated pursuant
25 to this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$50,-

1 000,000 shall be available only for projects authorized under
2 subsection (d) of this section.

3 "EVALUATION

4 "SEC. 233. (a) The Director shall provide for the con-
5 tinuing evaluation of programs under this part, including their
6 effectiveness in achieving stated goals their impact on re-
7 lated programs and their structure and mechanism for the
8 delivery of services and including, where appropriate, com-
9 parisons with proper control groups composed of persons
10 who have not participated in such programs. He may, for
11 this purpose contract for independent evaluations of those
12 programs or individual projects. He shall also arrange for
13 obtaining the opinions of participants about the strengths
14 and weaknesses of the programs. The results of such evalua-
15 tion shall be included in the report required by section 608.

16 "(b) The Director shall develop and publish standards
17 for evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving the
18 objectives of this title. Such standards shall be considered
19 in deciding whether to renew or supplement financial assist-
20 ance provided by sections 220, 221, 230, and 231.

21 "PART D—GENERAL AND TECHNICAL PROVISIONS—

22 "RURAL AREAS

23 "SEC. 240. (a) The Director shall establish criteria de-
24 signed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under
25 this title within the States between urban and rural areas.
26 In developing such criteria, he shall consider the relative

1 number in the States or areas therein of: (1) low-income
2 families, particularly those with children; (2) unemployed
3 persons; (3) persons receiving cash or other assistance on
4 a needs basis from public agencies or private organizations;
5 (4) school dropouts; (5) adults with less than an eighth-
6 grade education; (6) persons rejected for military service;
7 and (7) persons living in urban places compared to the
8 number living in rural places as determined by the latest
9 reports of the Bureau of the Census.

10 “(b) To assure that rural areas are able to utilize their
11 full and equitable share of assistance, the Director shall un-
12 dertake special efforts to increase the effectiveness of rural
13 community action programs. He shall describe these efforts
14 and their results in the report required by section 608.

15 “FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

16 “SEC. 241. The Director shall prescribe regulations to
17 assure that programs under this title are carried on subject
18 to adequate internal controls, accounting requirements, and
19 rules governing personnel standards and policies as may be
20 necessary or appropriate to promote efficiency and the effec-
21 tive use of funds. These regulations shall include provisions
22 governing matters relating to partisan political activities and
23 elections referred to in section 603 (b) of this Act.

24 “AUDITS

25 “SEC. 242. (a) Within three months after the effective
26 date of the first grant or contract of assistance with an or-

1 ganization or agency, the Director shall make or cause to be
2 made a preliminary audit survey to review and evaluate the
3 adequacy of the accounting system and internal manage-
4 ment controls.

5 “(b) At least once annually the Director shall make or
6 cause to be made an audit of each grant or contract of assist-
7 ance under this title. Promptly after the completion of such
8 audit, he shall determine on the basis of resulting findings
9 and conclusions whether any of the costs of expenditures in-
10 curred shall be disallowed. In the event of disallowance, the
11 Director may seek recovery of the sums involved by appro-
12 priate means, including court action or a commensurate in-
13 crease in the required non-Federal share of the costs of any
14 grant or contract with the same agency or organization
15 which is then in effect or which is entered into within twelve
16 months after the date of disallowance.

17 “SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

18 “SEC. 243. The following special limitations shall apply,
19 as indicated, to programs under this title.

20 “(1) Financial assistance under this title may in-
21 clude funds to provide a reasonable allowance for at-
22 tendance at meetings of any community action agency
23 governing board, neighborhood council or committee,
24 as appropriate to assure and encourage the maximum
25 feasible participation of members of groups and residents

1 of areas served in accordance with the purposes of this
2 title, and to provide reimbursement of actual expenses
3 connected with those meetings; but those funds (or
4 matching non-Federal funds) may not be used to pay
5 allowances in the case of any individual who is a Fed-
6 eral, State, or local government employee, or an em-
7 ployee of a community action agency, or for payment of
8 an allowance to any individual for attendance at more
9 than two meetings a month.

10 “(2) No officer or employee of the Office of Eco-
11 nomic Opportunity shall serve as member of a board,
12 council, or committee of any agency serving as grantee,
13 contractor, or delegate agency in connection with a pro-
14 gram receiving financial assistance under this title; but
15 this shall not prohibit an officer or employee from serv-
16 ing on a board, council, or committee which does not
17 have any authority or powers in connection with a pro-
18 gram assisted under this title.

19 “(3) In granting financial assistance for projects
20 or activities in the field of family planning, the Director
21 shall assure that family planning services, including the
22 dissemination of family planning information and medi-
23 cal assistance and supplies, are made available to all low-
24 income individuals who meet the criteria for eligibility
25 for assistance under this part which have been estab-

1 lished by the assisted agency and who desire such in-
2 formation, assistance, or supplies. The Director shall re-
3 quire, in connection with any such financial assistance,
4 that—

5 “(A) no individual will be provided with any
6 information, medical supervision, or supplies which
7 that individual indicates is inconsistent with his or
8 her moral, philosophical, or religious beliefs; and

9 “(B) no individual will be provided with any
10 medical supervision or supplies unless he or she has
11 voluntarily requested such medical supervision or
12 supplies.

13 The use of family planning services assisted under this
14 title shall not be a prerequisite to the receipt of services
15 from or participation in any other programs under this
16 Act.

17 “(4) No financial assistance shall be extended un-
18 der this title to provide general or curricular aid to edu-
19 cation in any school or school system other than for spe-
20 cial health, welfare, remedial, and other noncurricular
21 services designed to encourage successful participation in
22 school.

23 “(5) In extending assistance under this title the
24 Director shall give special consideration to programs
25 which make maximum use of existing schools, com-
26 munity centers, settlement houses, and other facilities

1 during times they are not in use for their primary
2 purpose.

3 “(6) In extending assistance under this title for
4 supplemental educational services of the type not pro-
5 hibited by paragraph (4) of this section, the Director
6 shall make maximum use of the services of the Commis-
7 sioner of Education, and of State and local educational
8 agencies.

9 “(7) No financial assistance shall be extended
10 under this title in any case in which the Director deter-
11 mines that the costs of developing and administering all
12 of the programs assisted under this title carried on by
13 or under the supervision of any community action agency
14 exceed 15 per centum of the total costs, including non-
15 Federal contributions to such costs, of such programs.
16 The Director, after consultation with the Director of the
17 Bureau of the Budget, shall establish by regulation,
18 criteria for determining (i) the costs of developing and
19 administering such programs, and (ii) the total costs
20 of such programs. In any case in which the Director
21 determines that the cost of administering such programs
22 does not exceed 15 per centum of such total costs but is,
23 in his judgment, excessive, he shall forthwith require
24 such community action agency to take such steps pre-
25 scribed by him as will eliminate such excessive admin-

1 istrative cost, including the sharing by one or more such
 2 community action agencies of a common director and
 3 other administrative personnel. The Director may waive
 4 the limitation prescribed by this paragraph for specific
 5 periods of time not to exceed six months whenever he
 6 determines that such a waiver is necessary in order to
 7 carry out the purposes of this title.

8 “DURATION OF PROGRAM

9 “SEC. 244. The Director shall carry out the programs
 10 provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June
 11 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each
 12 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the
 13 Congress may authorize by law.”

14 AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—RURAL AREAS PROGRAMS

15 SEC. 105. (a) Title III of the Economic Opportunity
 16 Act of 1964 is amended by (1) inserting immediately un-
 17 der the title heading a new part heading to read “PART A—
 18 RURAL LOAN PROGRAM”, and (2) striking out the heading
 19 immediately before section 302 and inserting in lieu thereof
 20 a new heading to read “LOANS TO FAMILIES”.

21 (b) Section 301 of such Act is amended to read as
 22 follows:

23 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

24 “SEC. 301. It is the purpose of this part to meet some
 25 of the special needs of low-income rural families by estab-

1 lishing a program of loans to assist in raising and maintain-
 2 ing their income and living standards.”

3 (c) Section 302 (a) of such Act is amended by insert-
 4 ing the word “principal” after the word “aggregate”.

5 (d) Section 606 of such Act is transferred from title VI
 6 thereof to the end of part A of title III, is redesignated as
 7 section 306, and amended by striking out “titles III of this
 8 Act” in subsections (a) and (d) and inserting in lieu
 9 thereof “this part”.

10 (e) Part B of title III of such Act is amended to read
 11 as follows:

12 “PART B—ASSISTANCE FOR MIGRANT, AND OTHER SEA-
 13 SONALLY EMPLOYED, FARMWORKERS AND THEIR
 14 FAMILIES

15 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

16 “SEC. 311. The purpose of this part is to assist migrant
 17 and seasonal farmworkers and their families to improve
 18 their living conditions and develop skills necessary for a
 19 productive and self-sufficient life in an increasingly com-
 20 plex and technological society.

21 “FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

22 “SEC. 312. (a) The Director may provide financial as-
 23 sistance to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit
 24 institutions and cooperatives in developing and carrying out
 25 programs to fulfill the purpose of this part.

1 “(b) Programs assisted under this part may include
2 projects or activities—

3 “(1) to meet the immediate needs of migrant and
4 seasonal farmworkers and their families, such as day
5 care for children, education, health services, improved
6 housing and sanitation (including the provision and
7 maintenance of emergency and temporary housing and
8 sanitation facilities), legal advice and representation,
9 and consumer training and counseling;

10 “(2) to promote increased community acceptance
11 of migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families:
12 and

13 “(3) to equip unskilled migrant and seasonal farm-
14 workers and members of their families as appropriate
15 through education and training to meet the changing
16 demands in agricultural employment brought about by
17 technological advancement and to take advantage of
18 opportunities available to improve their well-being and
19 self-sufficiency by gaining regular or permanent em-
20 ployment or by participating in available Government
21 training programs.

22 “LIMITATIONS ON ASSISTANCE

23 “SEC. 313. (a) Assistance shall not be extended under
24 this part unless the Director determines that the applicant
25 will maintain its prior level of effort in similar activities.

1 “(b) The Director shall establish necessary procedures
2 or requirements to assure that programs under this part are
3 carried on in coordination with other programs or activities
4 providing assistance to the persons and groups served.

5 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, TRAINING, AND EVALUATION

6 “SEC. 314. (a) The Director may provide directly or
7 through grants, contracts, or other arrangements, such tech-
8 nical assistance or training of personnel as may be required
9 to implement effectively the purposes of this title.

10 “(b) The Director shall provide for necessary evalua-
11 tion of projects under this title and may, through grants or
12 contracts, secure independent evaluation for this purpose.
13 The results of such evaluation shall be published and shall
14 be summarized in the report required by section 608.”

15 AMENDMENT TO PART D OF TITLE III—INDEMNITY

16 PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

17 SEC. 106. Section 331 (c) of the Economic Opportunity
18 Act is amended by striking out “1967.” and inserting in
19 lieu thereof “1968.”.

20 AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT AND

21 INVESTMENT INCENTIVES

22 SEC. 107. (a) Section 401 of the Economic Opportu-
23 nity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out “enterprises;”
24 and inserting in lieu thereof “enterprises, with special atten-

1 tion to small business concerns (1) located in urban areas of
2 high concentration of unemployed or low-income individuals
3 or (2) owned by low-income individuals;”.

4 (b) Section 402 (a) of such Act is amended by—

5 (1) striking out “employment of the long-term
6 unemployed” in the first sentence and inserting in lieu
7 thereof “the preservation or establishment of small busi-
8 ness concerns located in urban areas of high concentra-
9 tion of unemployed or low-income individuals or owned
10 by low-income individuals”;

11 (2) striking out the period at the end of the next
12 to last sentence and inserting, in lieu thereof, a colon;
13 and

14 (3) inserting immediately preceding the last sen-
15 tence, “*Provided, however, That any management*
16 *training program so approved must be of sufficient scope*
17 *and duration to provide reasonable opportunity for the*
18 *individuals served to develop entrepreneurial and man-*
19 *agerial self-sufficiency.*”

20 (c) Section 402 of such Act is amended by striking out
21 the first subsection (b).

22 (d) Title IV of such Act is amended by—

23 (1) renumbering section 405 to read “407” and
24 inserting in such subsection “and the Secretary of Com-

merce" immediately following the word "Administration";

(2) striking out section 404; and

(3) inserting new sections 404, 405, and 406 to read as follows:

"DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 404. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall take such steps as may be necessary to insure that, in any fiscal year, at least 50 per centum of the amounts loaned or guaranteed pursuant to this part are allotted to small business concerns located in urban areas identified by the Director as having high concentrations of unemployed or low-income individuals or to small business concerns owned by low-income individuals. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration and the Director shall jointly define the meaning of low income as it applies to owners of small business concerns eligible to be assisted under this part, and such definition need not correspond to the definition of low income as used elsewhere in this Act.

"LIMITATION ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 405. No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to this title where the Administrator of the Small Business Administration or the Secretary of Commerce de-

1 terminates that the assistance will be used in relocating es-
2 tablishments from one area to another if such relocation
3 would result in an increase in unemployment in the area of
4 original location.

5 “TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND MANAGEMENT TRAINING

6 “SEC. 406. (a) The Secretary of Commerce is author-
7 ized to provide financial assistance to public or private orga-
8 nizations to pay all or part of the costs of projects designed
9 to provide technical and management assistance to individu-
10 als or enterprises eligible for assistance under section 402,
11 with special attention to small business concerns located
12 in urban areas of high concentration of unemployed or low-
13 income individuals or owned by low-income individuals.

14 “(b) Financial assistance under this section may be
15 provided for projects, including without limitation—

16 “(1) planning and research, including feasibility
17 studies and market research;

18 “(2) the identification and development of new
19 business opportunities, and the stimulation of new pri-
20 vate capital resources through the use of guarantees,
21 pooling arrangements, or otherwise;

22 “(3) the furnishing of centralized services with
23 regard to public services and government programs,
24 including programs authorized under section 402;

25 “(4) the establishment and strengthening of busi-

1 ness service agencies, including trade associations and
2 cooperatives;

3 “(5) the encouragement of the placement of sub-
4 contracts by major businesses with small business con-
5 cerns located in urban areas of high concentration of
6 unemployed or low-income individuals or owned by low-
7 income individuals, including the provision of incen-
8 tives and assistance to such major businesses so that they
9 will aid in the training and upgrading of potential sub-
10 contractors or other small business concerns; and

11 “(6) the furnishing of business counseling, man-
12 agement training, and legal and other related services,
13 with special emphasis on the development of manage-
14 ment training programs using the resources of the busi-
15 ness community, including the development of manage-
16 ment training opportunities in existing businesses, and
17 with emphasis in all cases upon providing management
18 training of sufficient scope and duration to develop en-
19 trepreneurial and managerial self-sufficiency on the
20 part of the individuals served.

21 “(c) The Secretary of Commerce shall give preference
22 to projects which promote the ownership, participation in
23 ownership, or management of small business concerns by
24 residents of urban areas of high concentration of unem-
25 ployed or low-income individuals, and to projects which are

1 planned and carried out with the participation of local
2 businessmen.

3 “(d) To the extent feasible, services under this section
4 shall be provided in a location which is easily accessible to
5 the individuals and small business concerns served.

6 “(e) The Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps
7 as may be necessary and appropriate, in coordination and
8 cooperation with the heads of other Federal departments
9 and agencies, so that contracts, subcontracts, and deposits
10 made by the Federal Government or in connection with pro-
11 grams aided with Federal funds are placed in such a way
12 as to further the purposes of this title.

13 “(f) The Secretary of Commerce shall provide for the
14 continuing evaluation of programs under this section and the
15 results of such evaluation together with recommendations
16 shall be included in the report required by section 608.”

17 DAY CARE PROJECTS

18 SEC. 108. (a) Title V of the Economic Opportunity
19 Act of 1964 is amended by adding the following new part
20 at the end thereof:

21 “PART B—DAY CARE PROJECTS

22 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

23 “SEC. 521. The purpose of this part is to provide day
24 care for children from low-income families or from urban
25 and rural areas having large concentrations or proportions

1 of low-income persons in order to enable the parents or
2 relatives of such children to choose to undertake or to con-
3 tinue vocational training, basic education, or gainful employ-
4 ment.

5 "GRANTS FOR DAY CARE PROJECTS

6 "SEC. 522. (a) The Director is authorized to make
7 grants to appropriate public agencies and private orga-
8 nizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost
9 of projects under which children from low-income families
10 or from urban and rural areas with large concentrations or
11 proportions of low-income persons may receive day care.
12 Such day care projects shall provide health, education,
13 social and such other supportive services as may be needed.
14 Project costs payable under this part may include costs
15 of renovation and alteration of physical facilities. Financial
16 assistance under this section may be provided in conjunction
17 with or to supplement day care projects under the Social
18 Security Act or other relevant statutes.

19 "(b) The Director may require a family which is not
20 a low-income family to make payment, in whole or in
21 part, for the day care services provided under this program
22 where the family's financial condition is, or becomes through
23 employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment
24 appropriate.

25 "(c) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the

1 Director shall give preference to projects providing day
2 care for children from low-income families or from urban
3 and rural areas with large concentrations or proportions of
4 low-income persons whose parents or relatives desire to
5 accept employment or to undertake vocational training or
6 basic education under this and other Acts.

7 “(d) The Director and the Secretary of Health, Edu-
8 cation, and Welfare shall take all necessary steps to coordi-
9 nate programs under their jurisdictions which provide day
10 care, with a view to establishing, insofar as possible, a com-
11 mon set of program standards and regulations, and mecha-
12 nisms for coordination at the State and local levels. The
13 Director shall give preference to applicants which show evi-
14 dence of coordination and cooperation between their projects
15 and other day care programs in the areas which they will
16 serve.

17 “(e) Each project to which payments are made here-
18 under shall provide for a thorough evaluation. This evalua-
19 tion shall be conducted by such agency or independent pub-
20 lic or private organization as the Director shall designate,
21 with a view to determining, among other things, the extent
22 to which the day care provided may have increased the em-
23 ployment of parents and relatives of the children served,
24 the extent to which such day care may have reduced the
25 costs of aid and services to such children, the extent to which

1 such children have received health and educational bene-
2 fits, and the extent to which the project has been coordi-
3 nated with other day care activities in the area served. Up
4 to 100 per centum of the costs of evaluation may be paid
5 by the Director from funds appropriated for the purposes
6 of carrying out this part. Such evaluations, together with a
7 report on the program described in this part, shall be in-
8 cluded in the report required by section 608.

9 "TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

10 RECIPIENTS IN DAY CARE PROJECTS

11 "SEC. 523. (a) The Director, the Secretary of Labor,
12 and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall
13 take all necessary steps in the operation of vocational train-
14 ing, work experience, and basic education programs under
15 their jurisdiction to train unemployed or low-income indi-
16 viduals in day care projects under this part.

17 "(b) In carrying out the provisions of this part, the
18 Director shall give preference to projects in which unem-
19 ployed or low-income individuals are to be employed includ-
20 ing individuals receiving or eligible to receive assistance
21 under the Social Security Act.

22 "DURATION OF PROGRAMS

23 "SEC. 524. The Director shall carry out the programs
24 provided for in this part during the fiscal year ending June
25 30, 1968, and the two succeeding fiscal years."

1 (b) The heading of title V of the Economic Opportunity
2 Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

3 "TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, AND
4 DAY CARE PROGRAMS"

5 (c) Title V of such Act is further amended by insert-
6 ing after the heading thereof the following:

7 "PART A—WORK EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS"

8 (d) Sections 501, 502, 503, 504, and 505 of such Act
9 are amended by striking out "this title" wherever it appears
10 therein and inserting in lieu thereof "this part".

11 ADMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND
12 COORDINATION

13 SEC. 109. (a) Section 601 (a) of the Economic Oppor-
14 tunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "four" in
15 the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

16 (b) Section 604 of such Act is amended to read as
17 follows:

18 "APPEALS, NOTICE AND HEARING

19 "SEC. 604. The Director shall prescribe procedures to
20 assure that—

21 "(1) special notice of and an opportunity for a
22 timely and expeditious appeal to the Director is provided
23 for an agency or organization which would like to serve
24 as a delegate agency under title I-B or II and whose
25 application to the prime sponsor or community action

1 agency has been wholly or substantially rejected or
2 has not been acted upon within a period of time deemed
3 reasonable by the Director;

4 “(2) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and
5 III-B shall not be suspended for failure to comply with
6 applicable terms and conditions, except in emergency
7 situations, nor shall an application for refunding under
8 sections 123, 220, 221, or 312 be denied, unless the
9 recipient agency has been given reasonable notice and
10 opportunity to show cause why such action should not
11 be taken; and

12 “(3) financial assistance under titles I-B, II, and
13 III-B shall not be terminated for failure to comply with
14 applicable terms and conditions unless the recipient
15 agency has been afforded reasonable notice and oppor-
16 tunity for a full and fair hearing.”

17 (c) Section 609 of such Act is amended to read as
18 follows:

19 “DEFINITIONS

20 “SEC. 609. As used in this Act—

21 “(1) the term ‘State’ means a State, the Com-
22 monwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia,
23 Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, and for
24 purposes of title I and part A of title II the meaning
25 of ‘State’ shall also include the Trust Territory of the

1 Pacific Islands; except that when used in section 224
2 of this Act this term means only a State or the District
3 of Columbia. The term 'United States' when used in
4 a geographical sense includes all those places named in
5 the previous sentence, and all other places continental
6 or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United
7 States;

8 " (2) the term 'financial assistance' when used in
9 titles, I, II, III-B, IV, and V-B includes assistance
10 advanced by grant, agreement, or contract, but does
11 not include the procurement of plant or equipment, or
12 goods or services; and

13 " (3) the term 'permanent resident of the United
14 States' when used in titles I-A and I-B shall include any
15 native and citizen of Cuba who arrived in the United
16 States from Cuba as a nonimmigrant or as a parolee sub-
17 sequent to January 1, 1959, under the provisions of
18 sections 214 (a) or 212 (d) (5), respectively, or any
19 person admitted as a conditional entrant under section
20 203 (a) (7), of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

21 (d) Section 610 of such Act is amended to read as
22 follows:

23 "PROGRAMS FOR THE ELDERLY POOR

24 "SEC. 610. It is the intention of Congress that whenever
25 feasible the special problems of the elderly poor shall be con-

1 sidered in the development, conduct, and administration of
2 programs under this Act. The Director shall (1) carry out
3 such investigations and studies, including consultations with
4 appropriate agencies and organizations, as may be necessary
5 to develop and carry out a plan for the participation of the
6 elderly poor in programs under this Act, including programs
7 providing employment opportunities, public service oppor-
8 tunities, education and other services and activities which
9 assist the elderly poor to achieve self-sufficiency; (2) main-
10 tain a constant review of all programs under this Act to
11 assure that the needs of the elderly poor are given adequate
12 consideration; (3) initiate and maintain interagency liaison
13 with all other appropriate Federal agencies to achieve a
14 coordinated national approach to the needs of the elderly
15 poor; and (4) determine and recommend to the President
16 and the Congress such programs requiring additional author-
17 ity and the necessary legislation to provide such authority.
18 The Director shall describe the ways in which this section has
19 been implemented in the annual report required by section
20 608.”

21 (e) Section 610-1 of such Act is renumbered section
22 611 and subsection (a) of such section is amended by insert-
23 ing the words “a substantial number of the” immediately
24 before the word “persons” the second and third time that
25 word appears.

1 (f) Section 612 of such Act is amended to read as
2 follows:

3 “JOINT FUNDING

4 “SEC. 612. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the
5 President, where funds are advanced for a single project by
6 more than one Federal agency to a community action agency
7 or other agency assisted under this Act, any one Federal
8 agency may be designated to act for all in administering the
9 funds advanced. In such cases, a single local share require-
10 ment may be established according to the proportion of funds
11 advanced by each agency, and any such agency may waive
12 any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by
13 such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar re-
14 quirements of the administering agency or which the admin-
15 istering agency does not impose.

16 (g) Section 616 of such Act is amended to read as
17 follows:

18 “TRANSFER OF FUNDS

19 “SEC. 616. Notwithstanding any limitation on appro-
20 priations for any program or activity under this Act or any
21 Act authorizing appropriations for such program or activity,
22 not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount appropriated or
23 allocated from any appropriation for the purpose of enabling
24 the Director to carry out any such program or activity under
25 the Act may be transferred and used by the Director for the
26 purpose of carrying out any other such program or activity

1 under the Act; but no such transfer shall result in increasing
 2 the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity
 3 by more than 10 per centum.”

4 (h) Title VI of such Act is amended by—

5 (1) adding the following new section after section
 6 618:

7 “RESPONSIBILITY FOR FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAMS

8 “SEC. 619. Pursuant to section 602 (d), the Director
 9 shall delegate his functions under section 221 (b) (2) to the
 10 Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and such func-
 11 tions shall be carried out through the Office of Education
 12 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.”;

13 (2) striking out the heading “PART B—COORDI-
 14 NATION OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS” and sections
 15 611, 613, and 614; and

16 (3) inserting at the end thereof a new part B to
 17 read as follows:

18 “PART B—COORDINATION

19 “STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

20 “SEC. 630. This part establishes an Economic Oppor-
 21 tunity Council, provides for an information center, and pre-
 22 scribes certain duties and responsibilities. Its purpose is to
 23 promote better coordination among all programs related to
 24 this Act, with a view to making those programs more effec-
 25 tive in reaching and serving the poor, assisting State and

1 local agencies to adapt diverse Federal programs to varying
2 local problems and conditions, stimulating new and more
3 imaginative ways of combining complementary Federal re-
4 sources in the solution of specific problems, and generally
5 improving cooperation and communication among all levels
6 of government, agencies, and institutions in matters related
7 to the purposes of this Act.

8 "ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL

9 "SEC. 631. (a) There is established, in the Executive
10 Office of the President, the Economic Opportunity Council
11 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council'), which shall be
12 composed of the Director and the heads of such Federal
13 departments and agencies, such Presidential assistants and
14 such other officials of the Federal Government as the Presi-
15 dent may from time to time designate. The President shall
16 designate one of the members of the Council to serve as
17 chairman. Each member shall designate an alternative to sit
18 in his stead in the event of his unavoidable absence.

19 "(b) It shall be the responsibility of the Council to
20 assist the President in—

21 "(1) providing for the coordination of Federal pro-
22 grams and activities related to this Act;

23 "(2) developing basic policies and setting priorities
24 with respect to such programs and activities;

25 "(3) resolving differences arising among Federal

1 departments and agencies with respect to such programs
2 and activities; and

3 “(4) initiating and arranging for the carrying out
4 of specific actions or projects designed to achieve the
5 objectives of this Act.

6 “(c) The President shall appoint an Executive Secre-
7 tary of the Council. The Executive Secretary is authorized to
8 appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may
9 be necessary to assist him in the performance of his duties.
10 Employees of other Federal departments and agencies may
11 be detailed to the Council from time to time to provide
12 temporary assistance.

13 “(d) To the extent appropriate, a report of the activities
14 of the Council shall be included in the annual report of the
15 Director to the President and to the Congress, or in a sepa-
16 rate report to the Congress.

17 “(e) From the sums authorized and appropriated to
18 carry out the provisions of this title, the President shall re-
19 serve such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the
20 purposes of this section.

21 “RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DIRECTOR

22 “SEC. 632. In addition to his other powers under this
23 Act, and to assist the President in coordinating the anti-
24 poverty efforts of all Federal agencies, the Director shall—

1 “(1) undertake special studies of specific coordina-
2 tion problems at the request of the President or the
3 Council, or on his own initiative;

4 “(2) carry on a continuing evaluation of all activi-
5 ties under this Act, and consult with interested agencies
6 and groups, including State agencies described in sec-
7 tion 231 of this Act and the National Advisory Council,
8 with a view to identifying coordination problems that
9 may warrant consideration by the Council or the Presi-
10 dent and, to the extent feasible or appropriate, initiate
11 action for overcoming those problems, either through the
12 Office of Economic Opportunity or in conjunction with
13 other Federal, State, or local agencies; and

14 “(3) prepare a five-year national poverty action
15 plan showing estimates of Federal and other govern-
16 mental expenditures, and, where feasible, the contri-
17 butions of the private sector, needed to eliminate
18 poverty in this country within alternative periods of
19 time. Such plan shall include estimates of the funds
20 necessary to finance all relevant programs authorized
21 by this and other Acts, and any new programs which
22 may be necessary to eliminate poverty in this country,
23 and it shall include recommendations for such new
24 programs. The plan shall be presented to the Congress
25 and updated on an annual basis.

1 “COOPERATION OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

2 “SEC. 633. (a) Federal agencies administering pro-
3 grams related to this Act shall—

4 “(1) cooperate with the Director and with the
5 Council in carrying out their duties and responsibilities;
6 and

7 “(2) carry out their programs and exercise their
8 functions so as to assist in carrying out the provisions
9 and purposes of this Act, to the fullest extent permitted
10 by other applicable law.

11 “(b) The Council and the Director may call upon Fed-
12 eral agencies to supply statistical data, program reports, and
13 other materials as they deem necessary to discharge their
14 responsibilities under this Act.

15 “(c) The President may direct that particular programs
16 and functions, including the expenditure of funds, of Federal
17 agencies shall be carried out, to the extent not inconsistent
18 with other applicable law, in conjunction with or in support
19 of programs authorized under this Act.

20 “COMBINATIONS AMONG PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

21 “SEC. 634. In order to encourage efficiencies, close
22 unnecessary service gaps, and generally promote more effec-
23 tive administration, the Director shall require, to the fullest
24 extent feasible, that projects or programs assisted under this

1 Act be carried on so as to supplement one another, or where
2 appropriate other related programs or projects, and be in-
3 cluded within or otherwise carried on in combination with
4 community action programs. In the case of other programs
5 related to this Act, the heads of the Federal agencies respon-
6 sible for those programs shall, to the extent permitted by
7 law, similarly provide assistance for projects and activities in
8 a manner which encourages combinations with other related
9 projects and activities, where appropriate, and with commu-
10 nity action programs. The Economic Opportunity Council
11 shall, in carrying out its responsibilities under this part, make
12 a continuing review of the operation of this section with a
13 view to (1) determining particular groups of programs
14 which, because of their objectives, or similarities in target
15 groups or areas, are especially appropriate for combined or
16 closely coordinated operation at the State or local level, and
17 making recommendations accordingly to the President or
18 appropriate Federal officials; (2) evaluating Federal agency
19 procedures for carrying out this section, and developing or
20 recommending additional or common procedures, as appro-
21 priate; and (3) determining whether, and to what extent,
22 consolidations of Federal programs may be justified and
23 making recommendations respecting such consolidations to
24 the Director and the President.

1 "INFORMATION CENTER

2 "SEC. 635. (a) The Director shall establish and oper-
3 ate an information center for the purpose of insuring that
4 maximum use is made of Federal programs related to this
5 Act and that information concerning those programs and
6 other relevant information is readily available to public
7 officials and other interested persons. The Director shall
8 collect, prepare, analyze, correlate, and distribute informa-
9 tion as described above, either free of charge or by sale at
10 cost (any funds so received to be deposited to the Director's
11 account as an offset of that cost), and may make arrange-
12 ments and pay for any printing and binding without regard
13 to the provisions of any other law or regulations. In con-
14 nection with operation of the center, the Director may carry
15 on research or studies concerning the improvement of in-
16 formation systems in support of the purposes of this Act, the
17 adequacy of existing data, ways in which data generated on
18 the State and local level may be incorporated into Federal
19 information systems, and methods by which data may be
20 made more readily available to State and local officials or
21 used to further coordination objectives.

22 "(b) The Director shall publish and maintain on a
23 current basis, a catalog of Federal programs relating to in-
24 dividual and community improvement. He may also make

1 grants, from funds appropriated to carry out title II of this
2 Act, to States and communities to establish information
3 service centers for the collection, correlation, and distribu-
4 tion of information required to further the purposes of this
5 Act.

6 “(c) In order to assure that all appropriate officials are
7 kept fully informed of programs related to this Act, and
8 that maximum use is made of those programs, the Director
9 shall establish procedures to assure prompt distribution to
10 State and local agencies of all current information, including
11 administrative rules, regulations, and guidelines, required
12 by those agencies for the effective performance of their
13 responsibilities.

14 “PROHIBITION

15 “SEC. 636. (a) In order to assure that existing Federal
16 agencies are used to the fullest extent possible in carrying
17 out the purposes of this Act, no funds appropriated to carry
18 out this Act shall be used to establish any new department
19 or office when the intended function is being performed by
20 an existing department or office.

21 “(b) No financial assistance shall be extended under
22 this Act for the purposes of voter registration.

23 “SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES: TRAINING PROGRAMS

24 “SEC. 637. (a) It shall be the responsibility of the
25 Director, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health,

1 Education, and Welfare, and the heads of all other depart-
2 ments and agencies concerned, acting through such pro-
3 cedures or mechanisms as the President may prescribe, to
4 provide for, and take such steps as may be necessary and
5 appropriate to implement, the effective coordination of all
6 programs and activities within the executive branch of the
7 Government relating to the training of individuals for the
8 purpose of improving or restoring employability.

9 “(b) The Secretary of Labor, pursuant to such agree-
10 ments as may be necessary or appropriate (which may in-
11 clude arrangements for reimbursement), shall—

12 “(1) be responsible for assuring that the Federal-
13 State employment service provides and develops its
14 capacity for providing maximum support for the pro-
15 grams described in subsection (a); and

16 “(2) obtain from the Secretary of Commerce, the
17 Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Di-
18 rector of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the
19 head of any other Federal agency administering a train-
20 ing program, such employment information as will facil-
21 itate the placement of individuals being trained.

22 “DEFINITIONS

23 “SEC. 638. As used in this part, ‘programs related to
24 this Act’ and ‘coordination’ shall include the programs and
25 actions described in this section:

1 “(1) ‘Programs related to this Act’ include pro-
2 grams under this Act and all Federal or federally assisted
3 programs which have objectives which are, in whole
4 or substantial part, complementary to the purposes of
5 this Act, or which provide resources which may be
6 used in combination with resources under this Act to
7 assist in achieving any of the purposes of this Act.

8 “(2) ‘Coordination’ includes, but is not limited to—

9 “(A) actions to improve the common effective-
10 ness of programs in reaching and serving the poor,
11 such as actions: to extend services to new areas,
12 provide them in a common place, or structure them
13 so that they are more readily accepted or widely
14 utilized; to eliminate procedures or requirements that
15 may be inappropriate for or result in unnecessary
16 hardship to disadvantaged persons with limited
17 education or other special handicaps; to establish
18 common eligibility standards among programs serv-
19 ing substantially similar groups or operating in the
20 same areas; or to develop methods of operation or
21 administration that will provide new employment
22 incentives or opportunities for the poor;

23 “(B) actions to promote better use at the State
24 or local level of Federal assistance available under
25 diverse programs, such as actions to establish pro-

cedures for cooperation among State or local agencies seeking assistance from different Federal sources with a view to eliminating unnecessary duplication and service gaps and promoting common or complementary priorities; or to modify or improve technical or administrative requirements imposed by different Federal agencies that may operate to increase unnecessarily the burdens of State or local agencies, minimize their opportunities for the imaginative use of Federal assistance, or discourage their cooperation with one another;

“(C) actions to promote simplification and efficiencies through the joint or combined use of Federal resources, such as actions to develop new methods of processing requests for assistance or granting assistance that will enable Federal agencies more generally to use resources jointly in support of common objectives; to establish common priorities for purposes of program planning, research and demonstration activities; and to effect combinations among or redirect Federal programs or activities for the purpose of eliminating unnecessary duplication;

“(D) actions to improve communication and general cooperation, such as actions to strengthen

ties among regional offices of different Federal agencies and among such offices and other regional agencies or organizations; to develop and improve procedures by which Federal agencies may act together in promulgating or making available items of information, including information as to the availability and allocation of funds, which are closely related to one another for purposes of State or local planning and budgeting; or to develop procedures by which State and local agencies may be afforded new opportunities to participate in Federal policy decisions, including decisions on recommended legislation, affecting their capacity to operate efficiently and effectively.”

AMENDMENT TO TITLE VII

SEC. 110. (a) Title VII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

“TITLE VII—TREATMENT OF INCOME FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PURPOSES

“STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

“SEC. 701. It is the purpose of this title to provide incentives to welfare recipients to participate in programs which are designed to enable them to become self-supporting, and to complete such programs and become self-supporting within a reasonable period of time.

1 “STATE PLANS

2 “SEC. 702. Notwithstanding the provisions of titles I,
3 IV, X, XIV, XVI, and XIX of the Social Security Act, a
4 State plan approved under any such title shall include pro-
5 visions consistent with the rules prescribed or under this title.

6 “DEFINITIONS

7 “SEC. 703. For the purposes of this title—

8 “(a) ‘Public assistance’ shall mean any aid or assist-
9 ance payable pursuant to a State plan approved under title I,
10 IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act.

11 “(b) ‘Trainee’ shall mean (1) any person enrolled in
12 any program under title I, II, or III-B of this Act or
13 employed in any such program as a resident nonprofessional
14 or in any other combined work-and-training capacity, (2)
15 any participant in any program assisted under the Emer-
16 gency Employment Act of 1967, or (3) any person who is
17 in training to become a VISTA volunteer and who has been
18 designated a volunteer trainee or intern.

19 “(c) ‘Qualifying income’ shall mean (1) any amount
20 paid as wages under title I of this Act to a trainee in a pro-
21 gram described in paragraph (1) of section 123 (a) of
22 this Act (relating to Neighborhood Youth Corps programs
23 for youth attending school); (2) any amount paid under
24 this Act or the Emergency Employment Act of 1967 as
25 wages, training allowance, or stipend to any other trainee

1 during his first eighteen months as such a trainee; and
2 (3) the net income derived, during the first eighteen months
3 following initial receipt of assistance under title III-A of
4 this Act, by any assisted family from the assisted farm or
5 nonagricultural enterprise.

6 “(d) ‘Poverty line’ shall mean an amount of monthly
7 income determined by the Director, representing an approxi-
8 mation of the minimum level of income which is necessary
9 to support a family of given size so that it can live out of
10 poverty.

11 “ATTRIBUTION OF INCOME

12 “SEC. 704. Unless otherwise provided in regulations pre-
13 scribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
14 no payment made under this Act to or on behalf of any
15 trainee or VISTA volunteer shall be regarded as income or
16 resources of any other individual under a State plan ap-
17 proved under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or XIX except to
18 the extent that the payment is made available to or used for
19 the benefit of such other individual.

20 “AMOUNT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

21 “SEC. 705. (a) The amount of public assistance payable
22 for any month to any person having qualifying income shall
23 be the higher of (1) the amount determined under the State
24 plan without regard to this section, or (2) the amount deter-
25 mined under subsection (b).

1 “(b) The amount of public assistance which is payable
2 for any month to any person who receives qualifying income
3 shall be computed, for purposes of this subsection, as follows:

4 “(1) The amount of public assistance, excluding
5 assistance for medical care, shall be computed under the
6 State plan as if the qualifying income had not been re-
7 ceived (and without any provision for expenses con-
8 nected with earning the qualifying income).

9 “(2) If the qualifying income, when added to other
10 income of the recipient and the public assistance deter-
11 mined under clause (1), is insufficient to provide a total
12 income in excess of the monthly poverty line, the public
13 assistance payable (other than assistance for medical
14 care) shall be the amount determined under clause (1).

15 “(3) If the qualifying income, when added to other
16 income of the recipient and the public assistance deter-
17 mined under clause (1), exceeds the monthly poverty
18 line, the public assistance payable (other than assistance
19 for medical care) shall be the amount determined under
20 clause (1), reduced by a percentage of the excess. Such
21 percentage shall be determined so that public assistance
22 would be terminated if the qualifying income, when
23 added to the other income of the recipient, exceeded the
24 poverty line by 25 per centum or more: *Provided, how-*

1 *ever*, That such percentage shall in no event be larger
2 than $66\frac{2}{3}$ per centum.

3 “(4) Assistance for medical care shall be provided
4 in accordance with the State plan. In States where
5 the plan provides that assistance for medical care de-
6 pends upon eligibility for other public assistance, such
7 eligibility shall be determined in accordance with this
8 subsection.

9 “(c) If more than one member of a family receives
10 income, the income of all members of the family shall be
11 aggregated in making the computations under subsections
12 (b) (2) and (b) (3). The foregoing sentence shall not apply
13 in cases in which its application would be inconsistent with
14 section 704.

15 "SAVINGS PROVISION"

16 “SEC. 706. If, at the time the rules prescribed in section
17 705 become effective in his State, a trainee’s public assist-
18 ance is being computed in accordance with the prior version
19 of this title, it shall continue to be so computed until (1)
20 his rights under the prior version expire, or (2) he com-
21 pletes his participation in the particular program in which
22 he is a trainee, whichever occurs sooner. Thereafter, if he
23 receives additional qualifying income, his public assistance
24 shall be determined in accordance with section 705.”

25 (b) In the case of any State whose State plan meets

1 the requirements of section 701 of the Economic Oppor-
2 tunity Act of 1964 in effect prior to the amendment made
3 by subsection (2) of this section, no funds to which the State
4 is otherwise entitled under title I, IV, X, XIV, XVI, or
5 XIX of the Social Security Act shall be withheld prior to
6 January 1, 1968, as a result of such amendment; nor shall
7 funds be withheld from any such State by reason of any
8 action taken pursuant to a State statute which prevents the
9 State from complying with the requirements of such amend-
10 ment until the first day of the fourth month after the State
11 legislature next adjourns following the effective date of this
12 Act.

13 **VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS**

14 SEC. 111. Title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act
15 of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

16 **"TITLE VIII—DOMESTIC VOLUNTEER SERVICE**
17 **PROGRAMS**

18 **"VOLUNTEERS IN SERVICE TO AMERICA**

19 **"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

20 "SEC. 801. This title provides for a program of full-
21 time volunteer service, for programs of part-time or short-
22 term community volunteer service, and for special volunteer
23 programs, together with other powers and responsibilities
24 designed to assist in the development and coordination of
25 volunteer programs. Its purpose is to strengthen and

1 supplement efforts to eliminate poverty by encouraging and
2 enabling persons from all walks of life and all age groups,
3 including elderly and retired Americans, to perform mean-
4 ingful and constructive service as volunteers in part-time or
5 short-term programs in their home or nearby communities,
6 and as full-time volunteers serving in rural areas and urban
7 communities, on Indian reservations, among migrant work-
8 ers, in Job Corps centers, and in other agencies, institutions,
9 and situations where the application of human talent and
10 dedication may help the poor to overcome the handicaps
11 of poverty and to secure and exploit opportunities for self-
12 advancement.

13 "PART A—FULL-TIME VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

14 "AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH FULL-TIME PROGRAMS

15 "SEC. 810. (a) The Director may recruit, select, and
16 train persons to serve in full-time volunteer programs, and
17 upon request of Federal, State, or local agencies, or private
18 nonprofit organizations, may assign such volunteers to
19 work—

20 "(1) in meeting the health, education, welfare, or
21 related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migra-
22 tory workers and their families, or of residents of the
23 District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico,
24 Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or the
25 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

1 “(2) in the care and rehabilitation of the mentally
2 ill or mentally retarded under treatment at nonprofit
3 mental health or mental retardation facilities assisted in
4 their construction or operation by Federal funds; and

5 “(3) in connection with programs or activities au-
6 thorized, supported, or of a character eligible for
7 assistance under this Act.

8 “(b) The assignment of volunteers under this section
9 shall be on such terms and conditions (including restrictions
10 on political activities that appropriately recognize the special
11 status of volunteers living among the persons or groups
12 served by programs to which they have been assigned) as
13 the Director may determine; but volunteers under this part
14 shall not be assigned to duties or work in any State without
15 the consent of the Governor. The assignment of such volun-
16 teers in any State shall be terminated by the Director when
17 so requested by the Governor of such State not later than
18 thirty days or at a time thereafter agreed upon by the Gover-
19 nor and Director after such request has been made by the
20 Governor to the Director.

21 “TERMS OF SERVICE

22 “SEC. 811. (a) Volunteers under this part shall be re-
23 quired to make a full-time personal commitment to combating
24 poverty. To the extent practicable, this shall include a

1 commitment to live among and at the economic level of the
2 people served, and to remain available for service without
3 regard to regular working hours, at all times during their
4 term of service, except for authorized periods of leave.

5 “(b) Volunteers under this part shall be enrolled for
6 one-year periods of service, excluding time devoted to train-
7 ing. The Director may, however, allow persons who are
8 unable to make a full one-year commitment to enroll as
9 volunteer associates for periods of service of not less than
10 two months where he determines that this more limited
11 service will effectively promote the purposes of this title.

12 “(c) All volunteers under this part shall take and sub-
13 scribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by
14 section 106 of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001
15 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with
16 respect to that oath or affirmation.

17 “SUPPORT OF FULL-TIME VOLUNTEERS

18 “SEC. 812. (a) The Director may provide a stipend to
19 volunteers under this part while they are in training and on
20 assignment, but the stipend shall not exceed \$50 per month
21 during the volunteer's first year of service. He may provide
22 a stipend not to exceed \$75 per month in the case of persons
23 who have served for at least one year and who, in accordance
24 with standards prescribed by him, have been designated
25 volunteer leaders on the basis of experience and special skills.
26 The Director may also provide volunteers such living, travel

1 (including travel to and from the place of training), and
2 leave allowances, and such housing, supplies, equipment,
3 subsistence, clothing, health and dental care, or such other
4 support, as he may deem necessary or appropriate for their
5 needs.

6 “(b) Stipends shall be payable only upon completion of
7 a term of service; except that in extraordinary circumstances
8 the Director may from time to time advance accrued stipend,
9 or any portion thereof, to or on behalf of a volunteer. In the
10 event of the death of a volunteer during service, the amount
11 of any unpaid stipend shall be paid in accordance with the
12 provisions of section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950 (5
13 U.S.C. 5582).

14 “(c) The Director may provide or arrange for educa-
15 tional and vocational counseling of volunteers and recent
16 volunteers to encourage them to use the skills and experience
17 which they have derived from their training and service in
18 the national interest, and particularly in combating poverty
19 as members of the helping professions.

20 “PART B—AUXILIARY AND SPECIAL VOLUNTEER

21 PROGRAMS

22 “COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS

23 “SEC. 820. (a) The Director shall develop programs
24 designed to expand opportunities for persons to partici-
25 pate in a direct and personal way, on a part-time basis or for
26 shorter periods of service than is required for enrollment

1 under section 810, and in their home or nearby communi-
2 ties, in volunteer activities contributing to the elimination
3 of poverty. Pursuant to appropriate plans, agreements, or
4 arrangements the Director may provide financial, technical,
5 or other assistance needed to carry on projects that are
6 undertaken in connection with these programs. These
7 projects may include, without limitation, activities designed
8 (1) to encourage greater numbers of persons to partici-
9 pate, as volunteers, in local programs and projects assisted
10 under this Act, with particular emphasis upon programs
11 designed to aid youth or promote child development; (2)
12 to encourage persons with needed managerial, professional,
13 or technical skills to contribute those skills to programs for
14 the development or betterment of urban and rural neighbor-
15 hoods or areas having especially large concentrations or pro-
16 portions of the poor, with particular emphasis upon helping
17 residents of those neighborhoods or areas to develop the com-
18 petence necessary to take advantage of public and private
19 resources which would not otherwise be available or used for
20 those programs; and (3) to assist existing national and local
21 agencies relying upon or in need of volunteers to obtain
22 volunteer services more readily, or to provide specialized
23 short-term training, with particular emphasis on agencies
24 serving the most seriously disadvantaged, operating in areas
25 of the most concentrated poverty, or having similar critical
26 needs.

1 “(b) Persons serving as volunteers under this section
2 shall receive no living allowance or stipend and only such
3 other support or allowances as the Director determines, pur-
4 suant to regulations, are required because of unusual or
5 special circumstances affecting the project.

6 “(c) The services of any person, if otherwise allowable
7 as a non-Federal contribution toward the cost of any pro-
8 gram or project assisted under this or any other Federal Act,
9 shall not be disallowed merely by reason of actions of the
10 Director under this section in providing for or assisting
11 in the recruitment, referral, or preservice training of such
12 person.

13 “SPECIAL VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

14 “SEC. 821. The Director is authorized to conduct, or
15 provide by grant or contract for, special volunteer programs
16 designed to stimulate and initiate improved methods of pro-
17 viding volunteer services and to encourage wider volunteer
18 participation, in furtherance of the purposes of this title. Not
19 to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated
20 from any appropriation to carry out this title for any fiscal
21 year may be used for programs under this section.

22 “DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS TO HELP YOUNG ADULT

23 CRIMINAL OFFENDERS

24 “SEC. 822. (a) The Director is authorized to conduct,
25 or to make grants, contracts, or other arrangements for the
26 conduct of demonstration projects in not more than four

1 areas during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and in
2 not more than six areas during each of the two succeeding
3 fiscal years, under which—

4 “(1) volunteers under part A, and members of
5 the Teacher Corps furnished pursuant to this section,
6 provide criminal offenders aged sixteen through twenty-
7 five with intensive education, training, and counseling
8 for at least a six-month period prior to their release
9 from confinement and for at least a six-month period
10 thereafter;

11 “(2) not more than one hundred such volunteers
12 are employed pursuant to this section during the fiscal
13 year ending June 30, 1968, and not more than one hun-
14 dred and fifty such volunteers are so employed during
15 each of the two succeeding fiscal years;

16 “(3) the Commissioner of Education furnishes, on
17 a reimbursable basis, for the purpose of this section,
18 members of the Teacher Corps who have been re-
19 cruited and trained by one or more institutions of
20 higher education; and

21 “(4) not more than forty such members are fur-
22 nished pursuant to this section during the fiscal year
23 ending June 30, 1968, and not more than sixty such
24 members are so furnished during each of the two suc-
25 ceeding fiscal years.

1 “(b) Members of the Teacher Corps enrolled for pur-
2 poses of this section, who are not experienced teachers, shall
3 be compensated at the rate of \$75 per week plus \$15 per
4 week for each dependent. Such members who are experi-
5 enced teachers shall be compensated at a rate to be fixed by
6 the Commissioner of Education. Assignment of members of
7 the Teacher Corps pursuant to this section shall be without
8 regard to the provisions of section 513 (c) of the Higher
9 Education Act of 1965.

10 “PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 “COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

12 “SEC. 831. The Director shall take necessary steps to
13 coordinate volunteer programs authorized under this title
14 with one another, with community action programs, and
15 with other related Federal, State, local, and national pro-
16 grams. These steps shall include, to the extent feasible,
17 actions to promote service by volunteers or former volun-
18 teers in the full-time programs authorized under part A in
19 providing necessary support to programs under part B,
20 and actions to encourage persons serving as part-time or
21 short-term volunteers to make commitments under part A
22 as regular or associate full-time volunteers. The Director
23 shall also consult with the heads of other Federal, State,
24 local, and national agencies responsible for programs related
25 to the purpose of this Act with a view to encouraging

1 greater use of volunteer services in those programs and
2 establishing in connection with them systematic procedures
3 for the recruitment, referral, or necessary preservice orienta-
4 tion or training of part-time volunteers serving pursuant
5 to this part.

6 "PARTICIPATION OF OLDER PERSONS

7 "SEC. 832. In carrying out this title, the Director shall
8 take necessary steps, including the development of special
9 projects where appropriate, to encourage the fullest partici-
10 pation of older persons as volunteers in the various pro-
11 grams and activities authorized under this title and, because
12 of the high proportion of older persons within the poverty
13 group, shall encourage the development of a variety of
14 volunteer services to older persons, including special projects,
15 to assure that they are served in proportion to their need.

16 "APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW

17 "SEC. 833. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b),
18 volunteers under this title shall not be deemed Federal
19 employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws
20 relating to Federal employment.

21 "(b) Individuals who receive either a living allowance
22 or a stipend under part A shall, with respect to such services
23 or training, (1) be deemed, for the purposes of subchapter
24 III of chapter 73 of title 5 of the United States Code, per-
25 sons employed in the executive branch of the Federal Gov-

1 ernment, and (2) be deemed Federal employees to the same
2 extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 116 (a)
3 (1), (2), and (3) of this Act, except that for purposes of
4 the computation described in 116 (a) (2) (B) the monthly
5 pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under
6 the entrance salary for GS-7 under section 5332 of title 5,
7 United States Code.

8 "SPECIAL LIMITATIONS

9 "SEC. 834. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations
10 to assure that service under this title is limited to activities
11 which would not otherwise be performed and which will not
12 result in the displacement of employed workers or impair
13 existing contracts for service.

14 "(b) All support, including transportation provided to
15 volunteers under this title, shall be furnished at the lowest
16 possible cost consistent with the effective operations of
17 volunteer programs.

18 "(c) No agency or organization to which volunteers are
19 assigned hereunder, or which operates or supervises any
20 volunteer program hereunder shall request or receive any
21 compensation for services of volunteers supervised by such
22 agency or organization.

23 "(d) Persons serving as volunteers under this section
24 or under section 821 shall provide such information concern-

1 ing their qualifications, including their ability to perform
2 their assigned tasks and their integrity, as the Director shall
3 prescribe and shall be subject to the same procedures, to the
4 extent practicable, for selection and approval as the Director
5 requires under Part A of this title. The Director may fix
6 such procedures for the selection and approval of persons
7 who are low income residents of the area to be served by the
8 project and who wish to become volunteers as he determines
9 will contribute to carrying out the purposes of this title.

10 "DURATION OF PROGRAM

11 "SEC. 835. The Director shall carry out the programs
12 provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June
13 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years. For each
14 such fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the
15 Congress may authorize by law."

16 AMENDMENT TO THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND

17 TRAINING ACT

18 SEC. 112. Section 203 (c) of the Manpower Develop-
19 ment and Training Act of 1962 is amended to strike out "at
20 a rate not in excess of \$20 a week" in the second sentence,
21 and insert in lieu thereof "at a rate which shall not exceed
22 the average weekly gross unemployment compensation pay-
23 ment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of
24 total unemployment in the State making such payments dur-

1 ing the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which
2 such data are available,”.

3 TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

4 SEC. 113. (a) Part C of title I of the Economic Oppor-
5 tunity Act of 1964 is amended by renumbering the section
6 numbers to read 141 through 146, respectively.

7 (b) Part E of title I of such Act is amended by renum-
8 bering section 141 to read 161.

9 (c) Section 105 of title 3, United States Code, is
10 amended by inserting after “Executive Secretary of the Na-
11 tional Aeronautics and Space Council,” the following: “of
12 the Executive Secretary of the Economic Opportunity
13 Council,”.

14 TITLE II—INVESTIGATION AND EVALUATION
15 BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

16 INVESTIGATION

17 SEC. 201. The Comptroller General of the United States
18 (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Comptroller Gen-
19 eral) is authorized and directed to make an investigation in
20 sufficient depth of programs and activities financed in whole
21 or in part by funds authorized under section 2 of this Act,
22 in order to determine—

23 (1) the efficiency of the administration of such pro-
24 grams and activities by the Office of Economic Oppor-

1 tunity and by local public and private agencies carrying
2 out such programs and activities; and

3 (2) the extent to which such programs and activ-
4 ities achieve the objectives set forth in the relevant part
5 or title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 au-
6 thorizing such programs or activities.

7 REPORTS

8 SEC. 202. The Comptroller General shall make such
9 interim reports as he deems advisable and shall transmit
10 his final report to the Congress not later than February 1,
11 1969. Such final report shall contain a detailed statement of
12 his findings and conclusions together with such recommenda-
13 tions, including recommendations for additional legislation
14 as he deems advisable.

15 POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

16 SEC. 203. (a) The Comptroller General or, on the
17 authorization of the Comptroller General, any officer of the
18 General Accounting Office, may, for the purpose of carrying
19 out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, take such
20 testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as he
21 deems advisable. Any officer designated by the Comptroller
22 General may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses
23 appearing before the Comptroller General or such designated
24 officer.

1 (b) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of
2 the executive branch of the Government, including inde-
3 pendent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to
4 the Comptroller General, upon request made by him, such
5 information as he deems necessary to carry out his functions
6 under this title.

7 (c) The Comptroller General is authorized—

8 (1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such
9 staff personnel as he deems necessary without regard to
10 the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing
11 appointments in the competitive service, and without
12 regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter
13 III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification
14 and General Schedule pay rates, and

15 (2) to procure temporary and intermittent services
16 to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of
17 title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed
18 \$50 a day for individuals.

19 (d) The Comptroller General is authorized to enter
20 into contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms,
21 institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or
22 surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities
23 necessary to the discharge of his duties under this title.

1

AUTHORIZATION

2

SEC. 204. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

3

Passed the Senate October 5, 1967.

Attest:

FRANCIS R. VALEO,

Secretary.

90TH CONGRESS
1ST Session

S. 2388

AN ACT

To provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER 9, 1967

Referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 23, 1967
For actions of Oct. 20, 1967
90th-1st; No. 169

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....10,21	Farm Bureau.....16	Repeal legislation.....3
Air pollution.....15,22	Foreign trade.....7	Research.....26
Appropriations.....1,13,20	Forestry.....12,24	Spending.....9,14
Census.....23	Legislative program.....20	Tobacco.....3
Containers.....3	Meat inspection.....17	Water systems.....8
Continuing appropriations.....1	Milk.....2	Wilderness areas.....6,25
Cotton.....20	Naval stores.....3	Wildlife.....5
Economic development....27	Personnel.....19	Wool.....3
Electrification.....18	Potato labeling.....4	
	Poverty.....11	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported continuing resolution. Senate passed military milk program extension and repeal of Standard Containers, Tobacco Seed and Plant Exportation, Naval Stores, and Wool Standards Acts. House committee voted to report poverty bill. House debated bill to facilitate exchange of forest lands for schools. House committee reported bill to increase authorization for forest survey.

SENATE

- 1. APPROPRIATIONS.** The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. J. Res. 888, to continue the appropriations of agencies whose regular appropriation bills have not yet been enacted. The Daily Digest states, "As approved by the committee, the bill would continue appropriations to Nov. 15, instead of Nov. 23 as stipulated by the House-passed bill, and would delete House-imposed restrictions on Federal expenditures" (S. Rept. 672). p. D938
- 2. MILK.** Passed as reported S. 2179, to extend for 3 years the milk program for the Armed Forces and veterans' hospitals. p. S15057
- 3. REPEAL LEGISLATION.** Passed without amendment S. 2068, to repeal the Standard Containers Acts of 1916 and 1928, the Tobacco Seed and Plant Exportation Act of 1940, the Naval Stores Act of 1923, and the Wool Standards Act of 1928. p. S15056

4. POTATO LABELING. Sen. Church spoke in favor of S. 562, to require labeling of potatoes to show the State of origin, and inserted testimony before the Commerce Committee in support of this measure. pp. S15053-6
5. WILDLIFE. Sen. Yarborough thanked the news reporters "who have played so essential and commendable a part in bringing into the public eye the dangers which are faced by our American wildlife and endangered species throughout the world." He also spoke in favor of his bill S. 4, to create the Big Thicket National Park, Tex., and S. Con. Res. 41, to convene a World Conference on the Conservation of Wildlife. pp. S15060-4
6. WILDERNESS AREAS. Sen. Moss disagreed with the implementation of the Act to set aside wilderness areas and stated, "The policy to date has always been to preserve areas of wilderness in the parks, and there is no reason to believe that objective will change with the change of administrations or for any other cause. I think it peculiar that we should tell the Park Service to tie its own hands so far as future planning and management are concerned." p. S15066
7. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Mundt inserted a resolution adopted by the VFW "Opposing All Forms of Trade, Commerce, and Financial Assistance to Communist or Communist-Controlled Nations." p. S15066
8. WATER SYSTEMS. Sen. Symington commended the work of the Farmers Home Administration in helping a rural county in Mo. obtain a county-wide water system and inserted an article relating to this project. pp. S15068-9
9. SPENDING. Sen. Proxmire stated that "the absence of a budgeting priority system continues to create a shambles within the Government. Everyone wants economy in Government, but the methods now being pursued can only lead to disastrous conditions and overall higher costs." pp. S15078-9
10. ADJOURNED until Mon., Oct. 23. p. S15081

HOUSE

11. POVERTY. The Education and Labor Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 2388, amended, the poverty bill. p. D940
12. FORESTRY. Debated H. R. 10442, to provide for cash equalization of certain land exchanges proposed by public school authorities under laws authorizing the exchange of national forest or other lands administered by the Forest Service (pp. H13756-61). Rejected, 39-49, an amendment by Rep. Hosmer to provide that the funds go into miscellaneous receipts rather than into a special fund (pp. H13759-60). Rejected, 30-191, a motion by Rep. Hosmer to recommit the bill (pp. H13760-1).
The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 1136, to increase from \$2½ million to \$5 million the authorization for the survey of forest resources (H. Rept. 802). p. H13782
13. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference reports on H. R. 9960, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill (H. Rept. 803)(pp. H13754-6), and H. R. 12474, the NASA appropriation bill (H. Rept. 804)(p. H13756).
14. SPENDING. Reps. Joelson and Resnick recommended additional air-pollution control. pp. H13771, H13775

U.S.D.A.
SEA/TIS
LAW LIBRARY
ROOM 1406 SOUTH
WASHINGTON D.C. 20250